The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

A THEOLOGICAL Conference of Congregationalists is to be held at Cambridge under the Chairmanship of Dr. R. F. Horton from 29th June to 2nd July. The subject of the Conference is "The Christian Ethic and its Modern Rivals", and the papers and speakers are: "The Situation to be Faced", Dr. E. Griffith-Jones; "The Christian Good: Its Basis—The Ethical Teaching and Practice of Jesus", Dr. A. T. Cadoux; "The Christian Good: Its Content", Mr. E. Cunningham, M.A.; "The Christian Good: Its Constitutive Principle and Authority", Dr. R. S. Franks; "The Christian Good: How Achieved", Dr. C. Anderson Scott; "The Christian Good: Its Expression (*a*) In the Life of Society", Rev. B. C. Plowright, B.A., B.D.; "(*b*) In the Life of the Individual", Professor J. G. McKenzie, M.A., B.D.; Summing up, Dr. R. F. Horton. The Conference is to be held in St. John's College, and men will have board and residence in the College at a charge of two guineas, or 10s. 6d. for single days. Ladies will be accommodated near the College and will have meals in hall. Full information may be obtained from the Rev. N. Goodall, M.A., 89 Hadley Road, New Barnet, or the Rev. E. W. Johnson, M.A., Cheshunt College, Cambridge.

In October we hope to print a Conference Supplement which will contain the papers and a report of the discussions.

* * *

THE Centenary Meetings of the Congregational Union were well attended and, on the whole, reached a high level. The Chairman gave a timely address, while his hymn, sung at the Communion Service, happily revealed that the day of Congregational hymn-writers is not over. Mr. Stanley Baldwin did the denomination great service by the healthy and thoughtful speech which he delivered. Our own folk, in the persons of the Rev. Arthur Pringle, and the Rev. Lionel Fletcher, preached the sermons for our Missionary Societies. The Centenary Commemoration Service was impressive in its dignity as well as for the vast seen and unseen audience which attended it.

It was a pity that the Assembly was not seen at its best in its business session. Congregationalists above all people ought to set the example of liberty and toleration to minorities, even though they be eccentric minorities of one.

And certainly the discussion on the attitude of the denomination to Army Chaplains was the reverse of well-managed. We do not

share the opinion that has been expressed that the introduction of such a resolution is likely to divide the denomination in the Disarmament Campaign. Nevertheless we regret that more thought was not given to the whole subject before it was introduced to the Assembly. It was a mistake to have such a discussion in time filched from the consideration of the important reports of the Union Committees: it was a bigger mistake still to limit the time to forty-five minutes; and it was the biggest mistake of all, after thirty minutes had been taken by two set speeches on each side, for chaplains to monopolize the fifteen minutes which were left. The vast majority of what might be called middle opinion in the Assembly had not the slightest opportunity to express itself. Practically all Congregationalists want the churches to dissociate themselves from the war system and give a lead to the rest of the world in the fight for peace: practically all Congregationalists believe that as long as some of their number are in the Forces, their religious interests must be cared for. What should have been brought out, either before the debate or during it, was the practicability or otherwise of having chaplains attached to the Forces who should not be under military discipline. Surely the first step was, in conjunction either with the other denominations in the United Board or with the whole of the Free Churches, to explore the situation that we might discover whether it is feasible for the Free Churches to have unofficial chaplains. There were those prepared to move a resolution referring the matter either to the United Board or to the Federal Council of the Free Churches for consideration and report, but they had no opportunity to speak. Possibly the Commission to be appointed will address itself to this question. When we know the answer to it, it will be possible for representatives to give a vote based on some knowledge.

Some, it may be, will be swayed by the fact that chaplains immune from army discipline will have to be maintained from non-State sources. This should not stand in the way if it be decided that it would be a good thing for the Free Churches to stand aloof from the Army system.

* * *

It is to be hoped that Independents will never allow a matter of money to determine a question of principle. Indeed, we should have proudly claimed, as it has been claimed more than once in the last hundred years, that there was no fear of this, were it not that we have been inconsistent in regard to education. One of the most heroic episodes in the history of Congregationalism was its effort in the forties and subsequently to build and maintain voluntary schools. It was on financial grounds that the struggle ceased, and from the Act of 1870 the Congregational position in regard to education has always been equivocal. Now not merely do the Congregational

authorities of denominational Schools accept Government grants, but many Congregationalists seem satisfied if they can keep "Rome" and "Anglicanism" "off the rates", while perfectly content that hosts of non-Christians should be forced to pay rates for the teaching of Christianity.

There are three possible views in regard to education. One is that expressed by Mr. H. G. Wood in this issue; another is what might be called the "orthodox" (at present!) Nonconformist attitude represented by the Rev. K. L. Parry—which stresses "no public money without public control", "no test for teachers", and the injustice of the single school areas. The third, which we believe is truest to Free Church tradition, has suffered much from the name it bears—"secular education". The opponents of secular education always say: "Of course your position is logical, but the British people won't have logic. They will have compromise".

Such a confession means that we must be satisfied with less than the best our brains can achieve, and never appeals to us in the least. What we should like to see is the Free Churches alert and vigilant in regard to every branch of education, aiming at securing the best for every child. Such vigilance would see that history was rightly taught, and then the story of religion and of the Christian Church would have its proportionate place; it would see that English literature was rightly taught, and there, we know, the English Bible would play a not unimportant part; it would see that what the West Riding County Council used to call—and probably does still—"Citizenship" was rightly taught also. But they would be equally vigilant to see that those who do not believe in Christianity were not taxed in order to teach what they do not believe, and they would work out a system whereby the churches themselves maintained efficient religious instruction for those whose parents desired it. It would, of course, mean the establishment of Free Church colleges for training teachers in religious instruction. Such teachers would all be Christians, and they would be peripatetic, serving a wide area. There would be practical difficulties, but they could be met. It would be costly, but it would be the best thing that could happen to the Free Churches if they were giving until it really hurt for the sake of a great principle.

* * *

The hurried way in which the Committee Reports had to be taken makes it imperative that attention should be paid to the subject of the Business Session immediately. As the work of the Union has grown so rapidly it has become increasingly impossible for the members of the Assembly to keep themselves acquainted with it in any real sense. When about twenty Reports have to be rushed through in an hour's time it does no credit to a representative Assembly,

nor does it give either encouragement or oversight to those engaged in the service of the Union in Committee work.

In the old days Friday morning was very often given to the consideration of Union business, and it may be that this will prove to be the best way of solving a difficult problem. Otherwise, surely it might be worth while to try the experiment of starring for discussion, both in the March Council and in the May Assembly, three or four of the Reports of the Committees each year, so that in the course of every four years the work of every Department of the Union would receive full and adequate consideration. The rest of the Reports of the Committee could be presented *en bloc* in a summary report by the Secretary of the Union.

* * *

The Assembly's resolution on Disarmament will produce little result unless it is backed by constant and well thought out propaganda in the churches. We welcome everything that is being done in the way of large demonstrations in which all the churches share. We welcome, too, the petitions organized by the Women's International League and some daily newspapers. No one, however, with any acquaintance with the minds of people inside the churches will feel confident that there is any effective belief in Disarmament even there. Most people desire to be sure that the other nations are going to disarm before they are willing for their own to take any long step forward.

Here is a great opportunity for an organization like the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. The trouble is that in some countries, like France, there is so little in the way of organized religion to which an appeal can be made. Attempts should be made to communicate with Christians in any land where there is a strong church life, and it is to be hoped that in a crisis like this even Roman Catholics and Protestants might be able to work together. It would be a great thing if all the Protestant Churches of our own country were to appeal to the Pope to unite with them in an approach to the Disarmament Conference at Geneva.

* * *

So an attempt is being made to resume conversations between Anglicans and Free Churchmen! We do not know precisely what is to be the subject of these conversations, but we hope that the Free Churches will consider carefully before they embark on another expedition in the Sahara of Orders, Sacraments, and the like. A great deal of energy that might have been devoted to the evangelization of pagan England was expended during the last decade in fruitless discussions. How much hope there is of any real result from

their resumption may be gathered from the Archbishop of York's *Thoughts on Some Problems of the Present Day* (Macmillan, 4s. 6d.). In this Visitation Charge, Dr. Temple discusses the Lambeth Report; when he comes to "Reunion and Validity" he shows himself to be still living in another world altogether from that in which Free Churchmen dwell. It is not by talk of any kind, and certainly not on subjects like "validity", that reunion will come. If the Anglican proposals for co-operation in evangelistic work mean anything, let the Churches unite in some enterprise of this kind, and in striving to secure disarmament. That is by far the best way to secure unity of spirit.

Ten churches in the borough of Hackney, representing six denominations and including the Anglicans and the Salvation Army, united on the day these words were written in a "Service of Witness" on Hackney Downs. Several thousands of people were present, and the underlying unity of the Christian churches was manifest in a way that would have been impossible if the ministers present had been discussing reunion.

* * *

We wonder if any valid reason can be urged by County Unions against the establishment of a Church Extension Loan. Why should not, for example, the London Congregational Union invite Congregationalists to invest in an £80,000 Loan to be used for Church Extension, interest to be paid, say, at four or five per cent, the whole to be paid off by means of a Sinking Fund within thirty years. The suggestion seems at least to be worth discussion. It would mean that a particularly hard-pressed generation is not burdened with the whole of the task of building churches. Perhaps the experiment might be tried first on a small scale. It need not interfere with any schemes that are in hand for raising money, but attempts to raise large capital sums by way of gift are scarcely likely to be very successful at the present time, and it is well to look round and see if any other proposals are feasible. There are many churches now finding it very hard to maintain their own work, which are being appealed to to increase their contributions to home and foreign missions, and also to raise sums for Church Extension. If trade were to revive—and we see no signs that it is likely to do so in the immediate future—it might be possible to be optimistic about Congregational Church Extension. Until it does, perhaps this Loan project would enable the churches to grapple with the problem.

* * *

The claim we have sometimes made that Congregational employers are generally to be found in the van of progress finds interesting illustration in a number of *Co-Partnership*, the quarterly journal of

the Industrial Co-Partnership Association, which has just reached us. Casually turning over its pages we noticed the names of Mr. P. Malcolm Stewart, Mr. F. W. Raffety, Mr. Theodore C. Taylor, Mr. Stanley J. Benham. We still believe that it is possible for Christian men, even in these days of rationalization and big business, to give a lead to industry as employers, trade union officials, and workmen, and it is gratifying to find so many of them actively engaged in the co-partnership movement.

* * *

HERE are three good stories from the *Life and Letters of Sir Edmund Gosse*:

> Gosse was staying with Henry James at Rye. James told him that some young actresses, staying at Winchelsea, had expressed a desire to see him, and had been over to tea.
>
> "I asked, 'Were they pretty?' He replied: 'Pretty! Good heavens!!', and then, with the air of one who will be scrupulously just, he said: 'One of the poor wantons had a certain cadaverous grace' ".
>
> Oscar Wilde, on being introduced to Gosse, said he was glad to meet him. Gosse said, "I was afraid you would be disappointed", and received the reply: "I am never disappointed in literary men, I think they are perfectly charming. It is their works I find so disappointing—"
>
> On a visit to England, Emerson was reported to have said things about Swinburne's *Poems and Ballads* which greatly offended the poet, who thereupon wrote to Emerson saying he felt sure he could not have used the words attributed to him. No reply was received. Some time afterwards Gosse discovered that Swinburne had written another letter. He said he hoped it contained nothing rash. Swinburne said it did not;
>
> "I kept my temper, I preserved my equanimity".
>
> "Yes, but what did you say?"
>
> "I called him a wrinkled and toothless baboon who, first hoisted into notoriety on the shoulders of Carlyle, now spits and splutters on a filthier platform of his own finding and fouling".

* * *

ONE of the raciest biographies we have read for some time is Miss E. M. Butler's *Sheridan* (Constable, 15s.). It is almost impossible at this time of day to find a new recipe for biography; the psychological study has become as familiar as the two volume biography of last century, and now one opens a biography of this type just as one goes to a restaurant, knowing what is on the menu for lunch because it is Tuesday. But Miss Butler has contrived to tempt even jaded palates. Her book, which she calls "A Ghost Story", is divided into two parts, "Sheridan's Posthumous Life", and "Sheridan's Previous Life". In the first part Miss Butler summarizes the divergent methods and the conflicting verdicts of previous biographers, and tries to find what Sheridan's contemporaries thought about him, and how far he reveals himself in his plays and letters. In the second she relates

his rise and fall, as suggested by the names by which he was familiarly known at different periods—Dick, Richard, Sheridan, Sheri, Dan.

We mention the book in these Notes not merely because its method proves as successful as it is unusual, but because Sheridan's story is one of the most regrettable and significant in English public life, and one from which lessons are too rarely drawn. Temperance advocates have trodden the same path so often that now it is hard and unyielding. They might begin to employ stories like that of Sheridan and some of his contemporaries with great effect. Here is Pitt, so drunk that he has to retire behind the Speaker's Chair to be violently sick, or staggering into the House with Dundas, so that the squib-writer enjoys himself thus:

> "I can't see the speaker.
> Pray, Hal, do you?"
> "Not see the Speaker, Bill?
> Why, I see *two* !"

But Pitt is not so tragic and pathetic a figure as Sheridan. With magnificent gifts, which secured for him great opportunities in two different fields, yet sinking into useless disgrace, leaving behind, instead of a record of work well done,a reputation for wit, fascination, eloquence, debt, and drink. No "might-have-been" is sadder than the writer of *The School for Scandal* and *The Rivals* and the orator whose speeches against Warren Hastings surpassed the oratory even of Pitt and Fox, or the dinner-bell Burke.

We cannot refrain from quoting the story which Miss Butler lifts from Lord Brougham. It should be found amusing to many besides journalists. Fox and Sheridan in 1779 collaborated in *The Englishman,* Sheridan writing the first two numbers and Fox the third. Naturally the paper had a great sale. But Fox and Sheridan were the last two men in the world to keep their noses to the grindstone of a periodical. Sometimes the Saturday number did not appear until Tuesday, and Mr. O'Beirne, afterwards Bishop of Meath, volunteered to have a Saturday issue always ready. Fox and Sheridan were delighted, and bothered no more. *The Englishman* incontinently died, on which Fox commented, "Ay, ay, I knew what would come of it. Our damned punctuality would be the ruin of it".

* * *

THE publication of the fifth and final volume of *The Diary of a Country Parson* (Milford, 12s. 6d.) surely deserves mention in these editorial pages. We cannot say goodbye to James Woodforde without regret, though perhaps it is as well that this volume is the last. As Woodforde got older (he died on New Year's Day, 1803) his interests became more and more restricted, and there is now little in the Diary beyond the usual menus, except references to his health

and his household. He ceases to take services in the parish church, and several curates appear in succession. Once or twice he and Nancy try their luck in a lottery; once or twice discretion prompts an entry in Latin or in Greek letters; but generally it is health and appetite alone. The amazing thing to the twentieth century reader is that the parson did not realize that his five meals a day aggravated his complaints, but right away to the end he records regularly:

> "My appetite, however (thank God) very good".
> "I think that I rather get weaker and weaker, and more and more fearful, but, thank God! my Appetite is remarkably good, and can relish my dinner daily as well as ever".

Surveying the five volumes the reader will not find it hard to understand the need for, and the success of, the Evangelical Revival. The Diary reveals the same picture of the clergy as that in Jane Austen's novels, described in Mr. Patten's article in this issue.

A word of thanks is due to Mr. John Beresford for introducing to the world a figure destined to live among English diarists, and for performing his editorial task in such an efficient and unobtrusive fashion.

* * *

Readers may like to be reminded that Congregationalists may obtain copies of *These Hundred Years,* the Centenary History of the Congregational Union, for 5s. if they order from the Independent Press on the official form before 30th June. Afterwards the price will be 7s. 6d.

THE HUMAN FACTOR IN INDUSTRIAL RATIONALIZATION.

It is stated that the goal of Rationalization is to co-ordinate industrial enterprise with the object of modernizing plants that are obsolete, systematizing manufacture and sales, and applying scientific research for the improvement of technique and the eliminating of wasteful competition by friendly co-operation. In theory this project is admirable, and no criticism can be offered of it, but in practice the results obtained by the process are sometimes quite different from the object aimed at.

It is well to recognize that two quite different motives may inspire the spirit animating the enterprise: the first, the reduction of manufacturing costs, and the increase of output; the second, the removal of inconvenient competition with a resulting increase in earning power. It is important that these factors should be kept steadily before us, for the first task is the problem of the industrialist, and the second the aim of the financier. It should be recognized at once that in many enterprises the modernization of business methods is long overdue—plants are out of date, manufacturing and marketing methods are frequently wasteful or antiquated, and modern and efficient control sometimes conspicuous by their absence. This is in part, but not entirely, due to the fruits of the War. Business was wholly disorganized during the period of hostilities, and the debacle which followed the advent of Peace in 1919 struck industry in this country a staggering blow from which it has never entirely recovered. One cause of this has been the enormously increased burden of taxation, which has made the modernization of business plant almost impossible, with an increasing dependence on the Banks for finance; so that immediate profits have become more important than a sane policy of conservative development, with an eye to future prosperity rather than to immediate success. That, however, is not the whole story. Industry has been crippled since 1919 by the ill-considered policy of Capital inflation which was commonly exercised immediately after the War, when reserves so re-capitalized should have been used for future business expansion or husbanded for possible trade depression. These reserves were re-capitalized as Bonus Shares and sold to the trustful investor at high prices. Speaking on this subject to a group of business men in 1919 I ventured to point out that the widely extravagant inflation of Capital that was going on immediately after the War was both immoral and unsound. The country to-day, like a man with a sick headache, is realizing the truth of that contention, for half of our industrial troubles would

never have presented themselves to us if our after War industrialists had kept their heads and refused to write up their assets.

Let us look at the effect of this operation. If reserves lie in a business they provide for it what is virtually additional Capital without a charge on the enterprise. In other words, they reduce the necessity for borrowing additional Capital from the Banks or public, on which interest has to be paid. It must be remembered that these reserves have usually been carried forward from year to year after a satisfactory dividend has been paid to the shareholder, and an agreed scale of wages to the employee. If, however, the reserves are capitalized by issuing them to the Shareholders without payment, as Bonus Shares, no further Capital is introduced into the business, but they immediately become an extra charge on the dividends that have to be paid. An extreme illustration of how this operates was given to me by a friend recently. Some fifteen years ago his wife purchased £50 worth of shares in a venture which, because it was virtually a monopoly, has been making very large profits ever since. By the constant re-issue of Bonus Shares, her holding now stands at £1,870, on which dividends have, of course, been regularly paid. On this basis, Labour is called upon to make a steadily increased contribution by way of extra profits in which it has no share of any kind.

I have said that one of the results of the post-War period has been a replacement in commerce of the industrialist by the financier. It is interesting to note what his contribution is. In its final issue, he is not a creator of wealth, but an inflator of it. Commonly his policy is to purchase a group of enterprises which have behind them a history of progress and profit, and to re-capitalize these ventures by transferring the reserves to Capital and by writing up the Ordinary Shares to prices at which they can be sold with a profit. If in the process he can eliminate inconvenient competition by the closing down of an enterprise which, by its activities or capable management, is reducing the profits of the other units, he does this without compunction, although this process may mean throwing out of employment workpeople who have been profitably engaged in it for a generation, and could continue to be so engaged. By this simple method he writes up the assets of the venture, perhaps by 100%, takes the lion's share as his profit, and then leaves the enterprise to the tender mercies of his nominated satellites. He has, by this method, contributed nothing to the prosperity of the venture. All that he has done is to make it necessary greatly to increase the earnings of the Group to maintain its old profits or, alternatively, to reduce the dividends which have originally been paid on the previous capitalization. Some of the great Trusts carry on this method as a regular part of their development, and by the simple expedient of buying a business at one price and selling to their group

at a higher price show paper profits which have never been genuinely earned.

This common mode of so-called Rationalization has been general since the War, and the reckoning is bound to come sooner or later. In many cases the Banks take a hand in this operation. They lend the money with which the purchase is made on the security of the Shares, and until repaid they become invisible partners in the enterprise. So long as the public is "feeding" (to use the common market phrase) this re-organization is very profitable, but sometimes the Banks step in, when all does not work out as anticipated, and then the painful process which is known as Capital Reduction begins.

Meantime, the industrialists who have created the enterprise have either retired or lost control, and have handed over the future administration of the business to men who have only increased profits before them as their goal. The outcome is the almost inevitable dismissal of a large or small proportion of the employees previously engaged in it, who, unless they are fortunate in obtaining other work, become a permanent charge on the State, either through the so-called "dole" or through other State aid. At the present time, with over two millions unemployed, under this charge must be reckoned sixty million pounds per annum Unemployment Benefit, forty millions Poor Law Relief, and assuming that, if fully employed, each worker would create only 20s. per week of national wealth, a further loss of one hundred million pounds a year—a total of two hundred millions per annum.

When it is agreed that Rationalization can effect real economies, I will try to show how, save in exceptional circumstances, it can only do this by entirely ignoring the human factor, which is ultimately the greatest source of national wealth; for increased dividends to the individual citizen have little value if the cost of obtaining these is the creation of a huge national obligation, and the fruits of the transaction terrible citizen waste. This aspect of modern business is a serious menace to the future well-being of our nation.

Let us see what the task of industry really is. The industrialist who thinks of his problem at all must accept one of at least two interpretations of his responsibility. The first is to regard it as an obligation to provide the largest possible profits as the fruits of his venture, and in this way to return steadily increasing dividends to his investors; the other as a primary obligation to give service to the community in which both Capital and Labour are entitled to equal consideration. Most of us would give lip-service to the second interpretation, but I venture to think that few industrialists are concerned with other than the first interpretation of their task. Yet the question must be answered intelligently, for on it rests the decision as to which goal industry will strive to reach during the next twenty-five years.

I think it may be fairly said of the industrial development of the second half of the nineteenth century that trade expansion, with the resultant profits, was the sole pre-occupation of the industrialist of fifty years ago. "To buy in the cheapest market and to sell in the dearest" was the ideal of successful business. Labour must be purchased at the lowest price, and made to give the largest possible return. Along these lines only could ultimate success be reached. The outcome of their view was the many squalid cities which grew up during the Victorian age. Wigan, the Pottery towns, Wolverhampton, and Elswick all came out of this conception of commercial progress. Another outcome of the same view was the birth of Trades Unionism, with its steadily growing antagonistic attitude towards Capital, and its insistence on shorter hours and a higher rate of wages. From this struggle there emerged the Compensation Insurance Acts, the Protection of Child Labour, the Industrial Health and Unemployment Acts, and all the other remedial legislation which endeavoured to secure a decent standard of living for the workman, who was at that time nearly always badly paid, and whose tenure of employment was full of uncertainty.

Immediately before the War a dangerous industrial situation was gradually developing. Trades Unionism was strongly entrenched and was becoming increasingly arbitrary in its methods. It had its delegates in the House of Commons who rightly were constantly agitating for further legislation. The political Labour Party, which was regarded by the other two Parties with contemptuous indifference when it first emerged, had become powerful and well organized, and for the first time Capital began to realize that it was a factor to be reckoned with.

The Masters' Federations had already been created to deal with the problem of Trades Union control, and were becoming increasingly powerful about 1912. Then came the War, and the resulting industrial chaos which sprang out of it. In early 1919, as I have already shown, huge War paper profits resulted in a re-capitalization of very many of our large industrial concerns. Assets were extravagantly written up, and large dividends either promised or distributed. The industrialist was exhausted as a result of facing four years of war, with all its anxieties, and either sold out his interests or willingly accepted the inflation of Capital that was offered to him as a foretaste of the millennium which he was assured was coming. Then came the debacle of 1920, from which the country has been suffering ever since, with Capital that disappeared in a night, assets that had to be written ruthlessly down, and a policy of merciless economy, in the application of which the little man frequently disappeared.

Out of all this has developed the spirit of Rationalization, with all that it means for our future Industrial development. This word, coined during the last five years, if it means anything, is intended to denote a more rational attitude to all the problems of industry, but it is generally interpreted as meaning the merging of businesses into large units with the object of eliminating unnecessary competition and cutting down working costs. Up to a point this aim may be entirely laudable, but unless closely watched it brings with it its own perils. It is a fallacy to believe that beyond a certain point size necessarily secures efficiency, or that impersonal administration can effect economies which are any more easily secured by decentralized control. Before examining this project, and seeing what is good in it and what its perils are, we must finally make up our minds what answer we wish to give to our original two problems. If the industrial goal is large and steadily increasing profits then obviously our policy will be quite different from an objective which concerns itself only with rendering mutual service both to Capital and Labour—a fair return by way of interest to the one, and equitable treatment and the largest possible measure of security to the other. To answer this question satisfactorily, let us see what the problem of the business man is. Rightly understood, he is a servant of two widely different interests in commerce, both of them equally necessary for the success of the enterprise. Capital and Labour are both his masters. He is also in constant conflict with life as it is and life as he thinks it should be. He is a realist in accepting the fact that he must somehow harmonize his point of view with the axioms of commerce as they operate to-day, but an idealist in recognizing that there are far-off better ways which he must strive to reach before his service is complete.

As the servant of Capital he is the trustee of men and women who have loaned to him their savings for profitable investment. The fact that he may have borrowed most of his temporary Capital by way of overdraft from a Banker—and most industrialists have, during the present distracted times, to live somehow on their overdrafts—alters this not at all. The Bank has only loaned to him the savings of small investors who have deposited their money there. As a servant of Capital he has a twofold duty which he must faithfully discharge if his obligation is to be carried out and his business to continue prosperous. The first is to preserve the Capital so invested, without undue jeopardy, and the second is to pay on it a reasonable margin by way of return.

Here the industrialist who recognizes the service spirit meets his first difficulty. What is a fair return on Capital? The answer must always be: "A rate of interest commensurate with the risk run". Money has a price value that can be as simply stated as the cost of

sugar or coal. At the present time gilt-edged securities, that is, securities which are as secure as anything can be in this uncertain world, return a yield of 5%. Industrial securities in the same category, that is to say, Debentures or Preference, earn 6% to 7%. The ordinary inactive Capitalist would, therefore, appear on a reasonably safe security to be entitled to anything from 8% to 10% on his investment, but not more, always assuming that the Capital of the Company is an actually subscribed Capital and not in inflated Shares.

Profits made in a business that is not subject to any special risks should be capitalized as reserves, or should be expended in the future development of the enterprise. On how these reserves should be dealt with when they reach a figure exceeding the point of safety I shall have something to say later, but at the moment I think the industrialist who wishes to discharge his services to Capital faithfully, may take this as a broad basis for his policy.

As a servant of Labour, the industrialist's task must be viewed from a different aspect. The claims that Labour can rightly make on industry are regular and continuous employment; a fair remuneration for the work done; some kind of stake in the enterprise itself; and freedom, in so far as that is possible, from the carking care of future unemployment. To secure all of these things is extraordinarily difficult, and in a final sense may be said to be impossible, for we must all face the uncertainties of the future and are never able to become entirely free from them. None the less, here is the ideal a just employer must keep steadily before him. Continuity of employment, of course, is dependent on continuity of good trade, and that again is governed by factors which are quite beyond the control of the individual employer. We have recently seen how the collapse of speculative share gambling in the United States has had its reactions on British trade, and how the over-production of manufactured goods throughout the world is now creating temporary unemployment for over two million of our fellow-citizens. The ideal position under which every man who is willing to work can permanently find steady employment is at present beyond our grasp, but methods can be adopted which will avoid the harsh reactions of temporary slack trade or the sudden expansion of a growing business. The simplest method of dealing with this is to avoid, so far as it is possible, a temporary increase of staff until the employer is satisfied that this is likely to be permanent, or the temporary reduction of staff in periods of slackness; first of all, to adopt a period of overtime as an alternative to engaging further staff when business is good, and then, after this has been continued for a month or two, to engage temporary workers who are employed with a due proviso that they are not to be transferred to the permanent staff until there is a reasonable chance of their being offered permanent work. Nothing is more

unsettling in business than to have to pay off employees who have regarded their work as permanent, and this step should be adopted only as a final expedient. This method, of course, does nothing to help forward a solution of the problem of national unemployment; it only provides a certain sense of security for the employees who are connected with an individual business.

The question of remuneration for other than executive labour is largely controlled by the Trades Unions or by the Trade Board Acts. A business which is well managed, however, and carefully watching every item of expenditure, and in which waste is as far as possible eliminated, can generally afford to pay a slightly higher scale to the employee than that fixed by the nationally accepted rates. This scale should either be paid in the shape of time allowed for a periodic holiday, or by the establishment of benefits which will be available, apart altogether from Health Insurance, in the event of employees being laid aside through a long period of ill-health. The wise business man gradually builds up a reserve fund for this purpose, so that employees who are needing either special surgical, medical, or convalescent treatment, may have what is necessary without cost to themselves. A contributory or non-contributory pensions scheme will also do a great deal to alleviate the problem of unemployment in advancing years. In the business with which I was until recently connected, we had for a period of twenty years a Prosperity Sharing Scheme operating for every employee who had given us five years' or more service. Under it we distributed some £40,000, and it has been of great value in making some sort of provision for the future. Its benefits are not distributed in the shape of cash, but as fully-paid-up Insurance Policies, which mature at the end of a period of twenty years. The policies are non-negotiable, but the Company makes loans on the security of them in case of necessity.

It is unnecessary to say that the industrialist with a sense of duty will see that the conditions of Labour in connexion with his business are healthy and humane. The health of the employee is his Capital, and it is the duty of every employer to see that this is preserved in the work that the employee is doing. The provision of proper healthy conditions of work depends, naturally, on the type of employment, but it is the clear duty of every employer to satisfy himself that everything that humanly can be done is being done to preserve the health of the employee. For this reason, purely routine work should be varied by a periodical change over for every employee. It is not difficult to organize this if the ideal is kept steadily in view, and in this way not only is the efficiency of the staff increased, but a welcome break is given in work that would otherwise be monotonous and uninteresting.

I have said that the wise industrialist does not attempt to return to the inactive Capitalist more than a limited dividend on the Capital employed, and that beyond this figure any margin should be carried forward to reserves for the future development of the enterprise. In some cases industrialists have endeavoured to meet this difficulty by issuing Shares without payment to employees, but this again is an unsatisfactory alternative. Shares so issued may be sold on the market by the employee, and so a purely speculative element is introduced into the business which may easily become dangerous. Again, an employee may die or retire, in which event the scrip passes on to other shareholders who may have no interest, either active or otherwise, in the future success of the enterprise. In some cases this difficulty has been met by setting aside a proportion of the ordinary Capital in the shape of a Trust, and issuing against these Ordinary Shares scrip which has no Capital value, but which ranks for dividend with the Ordinary Shares. These are distributed among employees who have shown more than ordinary merit in their work, and have, therefore, been regarded as entitled to special benefits in connexion with the business. This scheme is not an ideal one, but it at least recognizes that the reserves of the Company, after they have reached a certain figure, become the joint property of Capital and Labour, both of which are entitled to enjoy the benefits of the accumulation. It is sometimes argued by economists that after a fair return has been earned on the Capital, and an equitable rate of wages paid to Labour, the further fruits, if any, belong to the consumer, and should be reflected in a reduced price for the commodity manufactured. I have never felt satisfied that this argument was a necessarily sound one. The consumer is under no obligation to purchase; if he is not satisfied with the product that he buys, he need no longer continue to purchase it. But Capital and Labour are giving either their savings or their energy to an adventure from which they are entitled to receive not only the generally recognized return, but such measure of security as the industry can provide.

I have said that Rationalization has as its object the merging of businesses into large units in the endeavour to eliminate unnecessary competition and to cut down working costs. Let us see if this object can be achieved. In tariff-guarded countries, like the United States, the problem is not difficult. Competition from the outside is eliminated by the tariff wall, and to the extent that businesses engaged in marketing similar products can come together they are able, within certain limits, to fix their own prices. The check of competition is removed and therefore larger profits become automatic.

These mergers, of course, always safeguard themselves against the advent of new competitors. If their business is providing profits sufficiently large to attract a new industrialist, there is not insuperable

difficulty. While a new business is getting on its feet the merger can make competition so keen against the smaller man as to extinguish him, or, if he has anything to offer that is worth buying, he can be bought up or brought into the big family. This process is not so easy in a Free Trade country like England, for foreign competition must always be reckoned with. This is not so serious, however, as it would appear to be at first sight. The factor of "distance" is always a difficulty in commerce, and the increasing vigilance of the man on the spot can make it very difficult for a foreign competitor to gain a foothold. Economies can be effected by the shutting down of redundant plants and by centralizing manufacture. The process is a painful one for the businesses that have to be extinguished, but, provided the merger is adequately managed, savings may be possible by this process. Raw materials can sometimes, but not always, be purchased more favourably by the big mergers, and with an interchange of knowledge and experience, other economies may also be effected. All this can be set on the credit side of Rationalization, but these results can only be secured by the creation of a formidable machine, which, in my view, must increasingly disregard the human factor in its progress towards its goal.

It is inevitable that a great venture of this kind should become impersonal. It is too big to be handled with an all-round view of it by anyone individually. Personal control is replaced by executive control, and the smaller unit must either conform or be submerged. I am told, although I do not vouch for the statement, that the present price of flour in this country is fixed weekly by three men in conference, so that the price of bread for every woman in Great Britain under these conditions is decided by a small but very powerful Board. This result has been secured by the closing down of flour mills throughout the country. The local flour miller has gradually disappeared, to be replaced by the larger centralized organization. Meanwhile the employees of the old separate units have only been absorbed in part, and a number of them swell the list of the unemployed. There are other industries, some of them on a vast scale, operating on similar lines, which have built up a virtual monopoly throughout Great Britain.

I have tried to state—I hope fairly—what the advocates of rationalization claim as its advantages. What, then, are its dangers? By removing the spur of free competition it gradually creates a virtual monopoly, and has a strong temptation to exploit the public which it is supposed to serve. If "safeguarding" is added to its weapons it becomes virtually omnipotent and can dictate its terms to the unwilling buyer. No one who knows the facts believes that the public receive either cheaper or better service because of the Rationalization of the tobacco trade, and it will be interesting to

explore the service, in price and quality, which is given by the other great Trusts in this country as compared with the pre-War period. The inter-actions on the separate units, in a great merger, are nearly always harsh and merciless, dividends tend to become more important than the human beings who help to earn them, and so-called economies are often effected by ruthless lack of consideration of the personal factor. A centralization of the administration puts into the hands of an impersonal Board powers which can take little account of other than balance sheet figures, and grave injustices often creep in as a consequence. Even the members of the Board are often not free men. I am told of one great combine that the Chairman took from each Director his written resignation before he was appointed, so that he might dismiss him at a moment's notice if he considered it necessary to do so. How can an executive do its duty freely under such conditions?

Most important of all, Rationalization, in my view, cannot even secure what it claims for itself—a reduction in price to the eventual buyer of the product which it sells. It would be interesting to examine carefully the prices and quality of the products made by the various combines, and to compare these with the same products made by companies outside their influence. I believe that in the greater number of cases it would be found that, when all the conditions of work were considered, the combines offer nothing either in price or in quality which the smaller producer is not equally able to provide. The only things that are secured as a result of merciless administration are larger dividends, steadily increased paper capital appreciation, and increased unemployment. I have no hesitation in inviting any of the high priests of Rationalization to name any product, which is not a patent or covered by a monopoly or a secret process, that is being produced under more favourable conditions, or at a lower price, by a Trust, than the same article produced by private enterprise.

The most striking illustration of the effects of Rationalization in this country during recent years is the co-ordination of our various railway companies, which was completed immediately after the War. Under this scheme there was a centralization of the control of our railway systems, and an agreement on the part of the Government that in the event of the profits of individual companies suffering because of this arrangement, they should have rights of appeal for a revision of traffic or passenger rates. The results of this arrangement are too well-known to make it necessary for me to elaborate them. Traffic rates have been advanced in some cases to an extreme level. The passenger rates have often been increased by 100% or more as compared with the pre-War rates. Services have been reduced both in number and efficiency, and Railway Shares stand at a lower level than they have done for a generation. Defenders of the scheme will

say that the present situation has been caused by our national industrial depression, and the competition from road traffic, but its critics will reply that our industrial depression has in part been created by our high traffic rates, and that competent management would have controlled the motor-'bus problem before it had become formidable. It is impossible to measure the reactions on trade caused by this merger, but there can be no doubt that they are serious. That the present method is impermanent is now generally agreed by experts, and that a return to our pre-War administration is more than likely is also the considered opinion of many men who are familiar with the whole situation.

In the Coal Trade, of which I have somewhat intimate knowledge, Rationalization has been an unmixed evil, and none of the results which have been obtained by the various mergers therein formed have enabled them to produce coal at a lower cost than has been possible by efficient and properly equipped personally controlled collieries. The difficulties of this problem have, of course, been greatly intensified by State interference with the industry, which has resulted in the maintenance of collieries that would have been closed down as un-economic if governed by the usual laws of commerce, by the continuance in the industry of some 100,000 men who entered it during the War, but who are no longer needed in it, and by the replacement of the old laws of supply and demand by international political intervention. This is neither the time nor the place to discuss all the inter-actions of the baffling issues involved in the problem of the Coal Trade, but there emerges the undoubted fact that in the British Coal Industry, Rationalization has achieved nothing which has not been more successfully accomplished by enlightened private enterprise conducted by men who were experienced in the trade, and were free from the blighting influence of the financier or the politician. In making this claim I believe I shall be confirmed by everyone who has knowledge of the facts and no interested motive in controverting them.

In the Cotton Industry I believe the position is much more complicated. Here again the blight of after-War re-capitalization has done its devastating work, but there is general agreement that, in some cases at least, manufacturing methods have not kept pace in this country with world development in the industry. That there was unnecessary sub-division of the processes of finishing and dyeing and marketing is generally admitted, and the units which carried on the enterprises were often too small to conduct them successfully. When, however, allowance has been made for all of these factors, I am satisfied that even in the Cotton Industry, with all the handicaps that it must at present face, a business that is capably managed by a man who has been trained to grapple with all its problems will, in the future, hold its own against any merger which may evolve from

the present chaos, and will earn profits on its subscribed Capital at least as large in proportion as any that can be made under the control of a combined interest. It is by no accident that Courtauld's Artificial Silk enterprise, which is one of the most powerful in the world, is being carried on by the third generation of a family of silk weavers, and by a man who has the most intimate personal knowledge of the problems involved.

It is unnecessary to say anything about the development of the Trust spirit in the newspaper world. The *Manchester Guardian*, a privately controlled newspaper, is still incomparably the best newspaper in this country, while the Syndicated Press, managed by all sorts of financial mergers—of the full significance of which the public are quite unable to form any true opinion— has debased our British journalism to a standard below that which it has maintained during the last twenty-five years. Those who are interested in the true inwardness of this development should read Mr. Hamilton Fyfe's illuminating Life of Lord Northcliffe, in which they will see some of the baneful effects that have come out of the impersonal financial and journalistic control of our British Press.

According to the *Newspaper Finance Annual* for 1930, the announcement of the Rationalization plans in connexion with the Rothermere group caused an immediate fall in the Shares. Comparing the market valuation at the end of June, 1930, with the highest of 1929 one finds that the market capitalization of this group declined by no less than £29,000,000, or about 40%, the *Daily Mail* Trust Shares standing at £2$\frac{5}{16}$ as against £5$\frac{3}{8}$ at the highest. This enormous loss has, of course, to be faced by the public.

To make any reference to our Joint Stock Bank system is like laying one's hands on the Ark. How can we quarrel with a banking development that has created our five great Joint Stock Banks, and has secured for the fortunate shareholders in these enterprises a dividend which has consistently fluctuated between 12$\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and 20 per cent per annum? It would be interesting to learn, however, whether the Chairmen of these great organizations consider that industry as a whole has benefited by these great mergers. Quite certainly nearly all the great businesses which have been built up in this country during the last fifty years could never have succeeded in their early days with the present banking system, where collateral security is more important than personal character, and where banking control has very often had the effect of strangling progressive enterprise. The country banking system which provided a local Bank in each district, managed by local directors intimately familiar with all the needs of the clients for whom they were catering, may not have been able to provide the finance necessary for our present large scale industrial development, but it built up industry on sound

lines and recognized that personal control backed by personal character was the greatest security for steady industrial progress.

Let me sum up the conclusions I have arrived at as a result of carefully studying the problem of Rationalization ever since it was first advocated by industrialists in this country. It can, and sometimes does, effect economies by the centralization of its manufacturing plants, but as overhead charges, apart from labour, usually represent a fractional cost of manufacture, this saving is relatively unimportant. Against this, however, must be set the additional cost of a larger executive, and the loss entailed by executive as against personal control. It can pool its collective experience along the lines of research or manufacture, but it does this at the risk of standardizing a product which may be less than the best—and frequently is. It can, without any doubt, reduce labour costs by the adoption of automatic machinery and by so standardizing labour conditions as to avoid any unnecessary labour employment, and to that extent, make a larger contribution to the inactive shareholder. This, however, must have set against it the army of unemployed which it creates, and which becomes a charge on the municipality or the State—through their inability to get other employment. In this way it creates a fictitious profit, by refusing to bear its fair share of the burden on industry and so compelling the State to maintain its dismissed employees.

The question that we shall have to decide is whether its advantages outweigh its drawbacks, and whether it will be a final mode of industrial development in the future. If I were a Socialist I would welcome Rationalization as another step on the road to State Socialism, for obviously the larger the Trust the greater the ease with which the State can finally absorb it. But I am not a Socialist. All that it stands for is repugnant to me because it inevitably destroys the liberty of the individual—his most priceless possession. I am disposed to think, therefore, that it is a temporary phase, and that after we have gone through the inevitable disillusionment that will come because of the final collapse, we shall return to the development of trade along its natural lines, that is to say, the greatest possible measure of international free trade and the success of the businesses that are most capably managed and are developed on the most enlightened lines. With this change over will probably come the limitation of dividends, and the recognition that beyond a certain point managerial remuneration must be limited also.

Rationalization is the natural outcome of the endeavour made during the last twenty-five years by both the Trades Unions and Masters' Federations to standardize human endeavour. We shall be delivered from it when men of goodwill in both camps begin to

recognize that the human element in industry is of greater importance than either the machine or its profits, and are prepared to acknowledge that the spirit of service is the only one in full harmony with the law of life.

Rationalization is, in my view, largely a fetish. It is the outcome of business dis-organization unparalleled in the history of this country, which in turn is the product partly of the War and partly of industrial re-capitalization; it follows the outcry for Safeguarding, Protection tariff walls, and all the other specifics which we are prepared to experiment with, as a way out from our present distresses. If the final good for a nation is regular employment for the largest number of our citizens, with a fair return on the Capital invested and security of tenure for the employees engaged, then enlightened and humane private control can, in my view, accomplish all that the merger is able to achieve. It can do better, and generally it can provide larger employment, and can give better service to the community in the quality of product manufactured. If illusory profits, by way of ephemeral increases on the Capital invested, are desired, with mass production as the ultimate aim, and with no regard for the personal factor, then the great Trust may be the more effective medium, but it can only secure this result at the price of the destruction of all that is finest and best in our national life, and by a gradual evolution—if not revolution—to the time when the State will be forced to step in in the desperate endeavour to control the Colossus which will certainly otherwise destroy us.

Angus Watson.

MY EXPERIMENTS IN AUTHORSHIP.

My first book had its origin on this wise.

We had no breath of modern theological life in the system of doctrine taught us at New College, Edinburgh. Our Professor was an arch-Calvinist, and one who loved to put a keen edge of paradox upon his statements of doctrine. At Glasgow my companions, too, were fed upon Calvinistic dishes, though by a man of incomparably finer spirit and temper. But, just as we drew inspiration from A. B. Davidson, they drew inspiration from A. B. Bruce, who taught them the New Testament; and they persuaded themselves that the theology of "the Kingdom" (ethically interpreted) was to solve every modern difficulty. I had thought this hope more than a little exaggerated; however, when I began to preach at Dundee as an assistant minister, I set myself—in much the same spirit—to give the people a series of Synoptic studies upon the teaching of Jesus—"lectures", as the old Scottish tradition termed the more continuous expounding of Scripture. I was to deal with what our Lord said regarding Himself; omitting *St. John,* lest I should be choked with excess of supplies. As I felt my way forward, the Sermon on the Mount pulled me up sharply.

> Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.
>
> Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.
>
> Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.
>
> Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven.

Here was "Kingdom of God"—or "of Heaven"—at every turn. And what was this that the Master had said about "the law and the prophets"? And were there further teachings, on the same topic, which we could fill in from other passages in the Gospels?

I was still puzzling over these questions when the infection of scarlet fever made me a prisoner during long weeks. My poor mother came to Dundee to nurse me; and, during my convalescence, I dictated some notes to her which she took down in her family shorthand, copying them out in longhand in a clean place, and destroying the tainted original. Afterwards I worked from her copy, which turned out to be the ground-plan of nothing shorter than a book. During a wearisome voyage to New Zealand I composed five or more chapters, substantially as they ultimately got into print. On the home voyage, in my brother's company, I roughed out two or three more chapters; but, for some strange reason, I could make in the end

little use of these renewed efforts, although while at work on them I had enjoyed better health and better spirits than when outward bound.

Thereafter I worked on, although fitfully, and towards the end of 1883 was able to submit my MS. to Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, having obtained a letter of introduction to them from Dr. A. B. Bruce; they had published for him, and his books had succeeded royally. Being in London for other reasons, I paid a personal call at the office in Paternoster Row; possibly, as friends afterwards suggested to me, I lighted upon the less progressive member of the firm; at any rate, the whole atmosphere of the place seemed to vibrate with theological uneasiness. " We have heard from our reader—it is the book for *him,* no doubt ". I referred to Bruce's letter. " Yes, it is true; we have published for Dr. Bruce; but we are not very sure about his theological position ". Presently it emerged that the late Prof. Elmslie was the reader who had passed a favourable judgment upon my MS.—" but we are not very sure of Prof. Elmslie's doctrinal soundness "! I suppose the most appropriate reflexion arising out of all this is that it happened a long time ago.

I left; and a letter, dated 5th December, 1883, reached me after several weeks, which is something of a curiosity to-day. One paragraph evidently implies that I had urged, during our conversation or by letter, that Dr. Samuel Cox's publishers might have been expected to be reasonably broad-minded.

> We have to apologize for the long delay in letting you know our decision regarding " Christ and the Jewish Law " you were so kind as to offer us for publication.
>
> Dr. Cox has the entire Editorial control of the *Expositor* which we projected some years ago, and occasionally we could wish that some of the papers were a little less of the decidedly broad Church school.
>
> In a work like your own we quite understand that a question so difficult, complicated, and important requires to be handled in such a way as at any rate to give the appearance of being broader in its tendency than it actually is. Several of the material positions, we understand, that you occupy are not of those of habit and wont, and hence this divergence seems more than it is and is unavoidable in a discussion the aim of which is to defend Christianity against the attacks of the Tübingen School.[1]
>
> The subject being somewhat abstruse and lacking interest except for the initiated, we cannot expect scarcely a remunerative sale.
>
> However, as we like to be identified with works of ability, we shall have much pleasure in publishing your " Christ and Jewish Law " should you see your way to contribute, say, £40 towards the expenses of production and advertising.
>
> We should price the work we think at 6s.[2]

A further letter from Paternoster Row made clearer the obligation implied in the above letter to repay my £40 if the book succeeded, and to share possible profits.

[1] I cannot believe that, even in 1883, I described my book in such terms. They must have been part of the publisher's own self-justification.

[2] Wording and punctuation throughout as in the original.

I knew that some small capital was to be mine shortly, and I begged my mother to advance me the £40. But she refused[1]; I recognized that her theology and mine would never altogether tally, but still I had hoped she would help me. An Edinburgh publisher was even more coy than the London house; so I hung the thing up, telling Hodder and Stoughton that later on, if I could see my way to accept their terms, I might return to them. During the following two years I put in a good deal of work which aimed at strengthening the foundations in scholarship on which my study had to rest. At that time " Lady Lawson's Wynd ", leading from the " West End " of Edinburgh[2] to the neighbourhood of my mother's house in Chalmers Street, was being transformed into " Lady Lawson Street ". The roadway was being widened; the gradient was being made gentler and more uniform; and houses which used to be level with the " Wynd " were being underpinned. This seemed to me a parable of my own occupation.

My small funds having come to hand, I resumed correspondence with Hodder and Stoughton towards the end of 1885, and was surprised by the alacrity with which they accepted the MS.—accompanied by the indispensable cheque. This book, thanks very largely to Marcus Dods's highly favourable notice of it in the *Expositor*, came nearer achieving real success than perhaps anything I have since done. I had hit upon a good subject, and had treated it not too badly. Even Schürer, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, greeted " ein beachtenswerter erneuter Versuch zur Lösung dieses Problemes "; although I fear that his dictum would sell few copies at home—or, for that matter, abroad. The £40 came back to me, less a trifle or *plus* a trifle—I forget which; and presumably the publishers had secured their own modest profit.[3]

My second book grew out of a series of pamphlets which I proposed to call " Creed Reform Tracts ", and which I could never have flung at the theological and religious world had I not become possessor of a small yearly income through an uncle's death. Milder methods of easing my passage of the barrier, constituted by the necessity of signing the Westminster Confession of Faith, had failed me. I had recourse accordingly to somewhat violent methods; my mother, I now perceive, must have winced dreadfully. Mr. Walter Blaikie, of the printing firm of Constable, whose acquaintance I had had the pleasure of making at Biarritz in 1883-4, agreed to print for me, and

1 A kind friend, Miss I. G. Chalmers, told me afterwards that I ought never to have made such a request. Is that certain? There was nothing explosive about this earliest of my books; and my mother knew enough of its ground-plan to re-assure her on that score, had she been willing to treat at all.

2 By " West End " the inhabitants of Edinburgh understood the West End of Princes Street proper, where some six streets converge.

3 When I wished a copy to go to the *Athenæum* for review, I was assured that sending one would only mean " giving Samuel Davidson a chance *to spit his venom against evangelical religion.*"

tried to induce the late David Douglas of Edinburgh to become my publisher—of course at author's cost. Douglas declined; with an asperity which Mr. Blaikie felt hardly civil towards him. I next tried the Maclehoses of Glasgow, one member of the family having been my class-fellow at the University there. And, for old acquaintance sake, he and his brother agreed to publish for me; although, while far from being strait-laced in their own theology, they had no great relish for this public and noisy zeal on behalf of the reforming of creeds. Two pamphlets did appear, together, under the titles *The Obsoleteness of the Westminster Confession of Faith,* and *The Insufficiency of Revivalism as a Religious System.* The same Prof. Elmslie who had read for Hodder and Stoughton the MS. of *Christ and the Jewish Law* chaffed me in the columns of the *British Weekly* upon the extreme enthusiasm of publishing two pamphlets simultaneously; Mr. Gladstone might pull off such a feat with success; who else could? A fair hit; but then I was not publishing for profit, or even in order to attain a career, but simply to liberate my soul.

The most unkindest cut of all was Dr. Dods's condemnation of pamphlet No. 2 as " a mistake ". Now, of all eminent ministers of the Gospel in Scotland at that time, Dods was probably the least of a revivalist—I might even say, the most completely a non-revivalist. Had everyone else taught Christianity as Dods did, I should have felt no need to put on the brake; the contrary, perhaps. But, fair or unfair, Dods's censure carried weight; and A. B. Bruce's sympathy, being confined to a private letter, did little to redress the balance. "When——or——addresses the Free Church Assembly", he sarcastically remarked, "it is, *I am Sir Oracle; and when I ope my lips let no dog bark"*. Can any of the younger men understand what the religious atmosphere was in evangelical churches forty odd years ago, and in the Free Church of Scotland above all? My friends and I desiderated what we termed " ethical content "; the popular piety of the hour almost entirely confined its efforts to pushing human souls, as they sang in an estatic hymn-chorus, " Over the line—over the line ". I may have spoken with unseemly impetuosity; but what I said sorely needed to be spoken—then.

By this time the restiveness of the Messrs. Maclehose was uncontrollable. They would publish for me, as a favour; but they would not publish any more " Creed Reform Tracts ". In consequence I had to make a volume out of my remaining studies, and give them a collective name as *Essays Towards a New Theology.* This was a sumptuous volume; beautifully printed, costly to produce, pretentious in its air, and almost inevitably high-priced. It contained papers entitled " The Atonement, Morally Viewed ", " The Biblical Doctrines of Judgment and Immortality ", " Internal Evidence for the Truth of Holy Scripture ", and " The Calvinistic Conception of Grace ". There was a respectable amount of reading put into the

second of these articles; and the very titles of the first and third seem to make it plain that I was doing my poor best to be constructive. In the last paper, it is true, I was frankly polemical again. There are few Calvinists to-day, though there are many members of Calvinistic churches. Even forty years since, there were not a few nominal Calvinists in the communion of my birth who agreed pretty closely with my beliefs; but they could not forgive my frankness. Explicitly non-Calvinist theologians were more favourably impressed. Fairbairn must have seen merit in my work; and, many years later, I received a warm tribute—in conversation—from the late F. A. Russell upon this very book of Essays. Such tributes always seem to have reached me a little behind time. It was after I had published the *Essays*, and was full of concern for my new baby, that A. B. Davidson stopped me in Princes Street and told me he had been reading " my book " with pleasure, and found it " much better than Bruce's *Kingdom of God* ". I had to perceive that he was speaking of *Christ and the Jewish Law*. Presently he looked frightened—very characteristic behaviour in A. B. Davidson !—and begged me not to repeat publicly what he had been saying. Still, after so many years, I think the prohibition may be held to have lapsed. And only the other day a letter from a College Principal brought me a pleasant tribute to my *Hegel* and to another of my books; I think to the book entitled *From Comte to Benjamin Kidd*. Better late than never.[1]

Public reviews did little for the *Essays*. Bruce noticed me; but a rather colourless phrase, in which I excused myself for not paying much heed to Bushnell's successive doctrines of the Atonement, evoked from the reviewer what I can only call a snarl—much more pointed, and more quotable, than the succeeding paragraphs of not too cordial praise. When one is struggling for one's life, if not as a man yet as a theologian, it is hard if the distinguished friend on the bank does not throw one a rope but rather gives one a push down. " Even Bruce cannot stand him, you see "; there were persons who must have been overjoyed to have the chance of saying that. There was also an anonymous half-column in the *British Weekly* which compared me to a man declaring war upon his government because there were " puddles in the road " before his house. On its merits this was negligible—this was contemptible. But " all these things were against me ".

My third book also had strange antecedents, of a different kind. When I joined the staff of Lancashire Independent College, I tried to lecture freely from notes, following the example of Edward Caird. From the very first this caused trouble; and, towards the end of my second session, I had a communication from next year's Senior Student to the effect that he and his fellows wanted me to fall into

1 *Values*, too, has also been most kindly spoken of within the last few days; and even my articles " Theism " and " Theology ".

line with what (he declared) was the uniform custom at "Owens College", *i.e.*, the University—dictating word for word. "When we ask you to repeat something, you repeat it in different language". Of course I did! believing that the first step in digesting instruction given by lecture is for the student to take long-hand notes and so to make his own summary. In addition, it is, of course, infinitely desirable that he should read round what is given to him in the classroom. Traces of even a very little private reading improve a student's examination answers almost miraculously. I indicated dissent. "Well, we thought you'd be glad to know how we feel"; and on that we parted.[1] But I had not got rid of trouble by persisting in my own choice. At the end of the current session the youngest[2] member of next year's senior class brought to my door a letter signed by all five men "regretting" that they must "decline" to attend any more lectures of mine. I went to Principal Scott; he offered me no help; as he afterwards told me, an ineffective lecturer at Lancashire College had been got rid of years before in the same fashion, and he regarded my situation as hopeless. I next went to Dr. Goodrich, who sent me on to Dr. Mackennal; Prof. Wilkins, of the University, also interested himself in straightening things out. Finally, it was conceded that the Senior Year should have a class of a different order with me—submitting to me essays on selected subjects in Sociology; the men were told of this; and, after I had left the room, I believe they were warned that they had put themselves in a very perilous position by behaving as they had done.

Rather unexpectedly, this new system worked quite well. After a few weeks' experience the ablest man in the class reported to Principal Scott—who passed on the report to me—"we're having a very good time, Sir, with Prof. Mackintosh".[3] Emboldened by this, I tried in course of time to make a book out of the material we had been working at, and by good fortune *From Comte to Benjamin Kidd* was accepted for publication by Messrs. Macmillan. Their "reader", however, objected to some of my turns of phrase. It proved that this "reader" was Professor (not yet Sir) Henry Jones, whom I had known at Glasgow University. I alleged uncertainty as to what exactly was wrong; the publishers begged Jones to read my proofs and censure my language, as the need arose; Jones told me that he felt this was "cheek" on the publishers' part, but he had agreed. And therefore the book was refined or corrected in detail before it appeared in print.

1 There were, no doubt, difficulties of substance as well as of form. I had been shaped and moulded by Edward Caird's presentation of philosophy, and yet could not commit myself whole-heartedly to its influence—a twofold difficulty for minds which had been shaped and moulded by teaching given at University classes in Manchester.

2 In accordance with rigorous "house" etiquette.

3 In subsequent sessions I went back to lecturing even on Sociology; while making considerable use of small economic textbooks.

Jones was older, I think, than most of his fellow-students at Glasgow. My first distinct recollection of him is of his refusing a prize in a class of mathematics. Prizes were voted at Glasgow by the students in each class[1]; Jones felt that the place allotted to him was lower than his merits as shown at examinations required; and, in spite of all that Prof. Blackburn could say, he stuck to his decision—no prize, rather than an unworthy place in the list!

I also remember Jones on the occasion when he unexpectedly secured the great G. A. Clark philosophical scholarship over the heads of academically senior competitors. In the *Recollections* which he wrote for his own family, but which were afterwards published, he plumes himself amusingly upon his defeat of K. and L. M., who was not worth mention, was also sitting for a scholarship at the time; and I had my own grudge against J. because, in order to make all secure, Jones had put down his name for the Eglinton scholarship as well, although there was a certain paper required for the "Eglinton" which he was not attempting at all! I feared what might happen; but of course, when Jones gained his rich prize, my humbler ambition was no longer threatened by competition from him —or from any other; in those happy days at Glasgow it was most frequently a case of one scholarship one candidate. I recall how we walked away in a group after writing our answers to a certain paper; how we talked over a question based upon A. J. Balfour's criticisms of Transcendentalism,[2] and discussed the right way to meet them; how L. re-assured J. by giving approval to the outline of J.'s answer —L., the inferior, encouraging the triumphantly victorious J! as a few hours or days were to reveal.

My book represented a recoil in my mind back towards the Hegelian-Idealist position of the great Edward Caird tradition.[3] Kidd's contempt for Reason led me to ask whether a great deal more must not be made of Reason, in laying foundations for sociology. The book was respectably successful with the reviewers; not more. And of course I had struck in, midway, where the evolution of thought was much less of a finished unity than I had supposed. Nietzsche was only a name to me; Mendel was only a name to me. It has been affirmed that the acceptance of a book for publication by the firm of Macmillan is a distinction in itself; and A. B. Bruce had told me that he considered them the "noblest" publishers—the least commercialized, and the most ready to allow modest merit its chance. Unfortunately, with this book I seem to have exhausted whatever of nobility was available in that quarter for a writer of no greater powers than mine. When I approached Macmillan some years later they

1 With the exception, if my memory serves me rightly, of Sir Wm. Thomson's (Lord Kelvin's) class—"Natural Philosophy".

2 In *Mind;* part of the material used in his *Defence of Philosophic Doubt.*

3 Along with a careful statement of what an outsider could understand of current biological speculations.

refused even to look at the MS. which I then wished to submit; they consulted their ledgers, and promptly turned me down.

Perhaps the most unexpected honour of my life was when I was asked to contribute the articles " Theism " and " Theology ", with some smaller ones, to the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. I believe that my friend Dr. Vernon Bartlet had been good enough to suggest my name; but I have sometimes wondered whether its acceptance by the authorities of the *Encyclopædia* may not have been due to the circumstance that they confused me with the more distinguished Dr. H. R. Mackintosh of Edinburgh.[1] " Theism " was in the line of my own work; " Theology " was, up to that date, a little beyond my frontier; and I suffered considerable qualms in taking such a responsibility upon myself. However, Dr. Adeney and Dr. Peake were both good enough to read the proofs of " Theology "—a quite sufficient guarantee of essential accuracy; and, although I think I should myself correct one or two expressions if I were doing the work to-day, still upon the whole I stand by what I said, and believe it to have been rightly and helpfully expressed, to the best of my powers. The singular thing was that I never met with any criticisms, whether in the way of praise or of blame. It was said that " the most important article in the department of theology was (the American) Professor Knox's article *Christianity* "; a few laudatory remarks were added on *Christianity*—and that, so far as my knowledge goes, was all. Further, when the new edition of the *Encyclopædia* was announced, the larger articles were taken out of my hands and entrusted to more conspicuous writers, although some small fragments were left to me. I consulted friends—Was it worth my while to accept this poor compromise? They advised me to do so; and I followed their guidance. In consequence, I endeavoured to sparkle in my remaining half-columns, according to instructions received. But my real work was done for the eleventh edition. And it is possible that informed opinion may finally rank the eleventh edition, as a whole, higher than the smarter and snappier 14th.

The next batch of my rather numerous productions may be bracketed together as not only having been written to order, but as having been contributed to *series*. There was actually a book which I was invited to write, and did not—*St. Matthew*, in the little " Century Bible ". I have always felt that that short commentary ought to have been my own child instead of being the child of strangers. But I feared to overtax myself, or to do injustice to other commitments. When I did contribute to commentaries—*Thessalonians and Corinthians* for Melrose's small " Westminster N.T." edited by Dr. Garvie; *Galatians* for *Peake's Commentary*—I felt it to be the most delightful work I had ever known, and only wished

[1] I have had to spend an appreciable fraction of my lifetime in explaining to strangers that I really am not Dr. Hugh Ross Mackintosh.

that I had scholarship enough to warrant my undertaking more of it, upon a larger scale. *Hegel and Hegelianism* (T. and T. Clark) was hailed by the editor as " one of the best volumes in the series "; perhaps editors have to abound in civilities of that order. He added the hope that "it might be adopted as a textbook" in some quarters. Alas! the hope does not seem ever to have been fulfilled. *Christian Ethics* was written for the remarkably cheap—and sound—collection of " Century Bible Handbooks " edited by Principal Adeney (T. C. and E. C. Jack). I fear that the series was unduly cheap, and had to be withdrawn for that reason from circulation. *Christianity and Sin* was assigned to me by Professor Peake in Duckworth's " Studies in Theology ". The only apology I have to make for this book is that I took very seriously the obligation to keep within the number of words officially permitted, and that in consequence the diction—while not pure " telegraphese "—is often unduly curt. *Albrecht Ritschl and his School* was written for a series, a young series, which the war killed. The editor had suggested that I might write upon the older German rationalists—Bretschneider, *etc.* I replied that I did not think there was material for a book of any interest in that quarter, but that I was more than willing to write upon Ritschl; in addition, Ritschlianism had to be thrown in as a make-weight. In this case, as the preface confesses, the troublesome limit was one of time—not of space. Had I been allowed longer, I might had succeeded far better. Yet, to what end? Who can fight against conditions set up by a world war?

Non-serial were *A First Primer of Apologetics*, which grew out of addresses to Sunday School teachers, and is the only book of mine which has ever had the delightful words *Second Edition* inscribed on its title-page; also *Principal Rainy, a Biographical Study*. I had been asked to address a South Manchester Free Church Council, and had selected as my subject Dr. Rainy, who had recently died. Next, Dr. Peake accepted my paper on Rainy for the *Holborn Review*. Thirdly, an old Glasgow classmate asked me for my personal recollections of Dr. Rainy *q·a* cousin and *qua* College Principal, and printed them in *Young Scotland*. Fourthly, my friend the late Andrew Melrose saw what I had written, and was indignant—" Man! did you really give away for nothing such excellent stuff as that? " So indignant indeed was he that he insisted upon my turning it into a book, which book he undertook to publish. The necessary work had to be done in a great hurry; my various materials, I thought, came together surprisingly well. But alas! something much more hagiological was in request, especially at that moment; I had been respectful, but I had been discriminating; and the small cheque which my friend handed me " in advance of royalties " came, I fear, out of his own pocket and was never made good to him. Personally, I allow myself to recall with comfort that the *Manchester Guardian*

gave me a short notice on one of its centre pages, and praised my work. I may well mark the day of that issue with a white stone.

I felt as if I had a stronger appeal to make with books which were *not* part of the machinery of any series, but were due to an intense inward prompting. *Historic Theories of Atonement* grew out of class lectures on that great subject. My more recent little treatise on *Values* was, to speak frankly, an over-grown review article, and had to be published at my own cost—it would appear, unfortunately, that few readers have much use for my own thoughts upon my own themes. Perhaps the inference is that a mind of the second rank had better confine itself to team-work, in the stereotyped mass-production of this or that series. Or perhaps another lesson is that, if I had gone past historic theories to the great spiritual reality itself—and had gone past values to Value—I might have had a stronger claim upon the notice of this busy generation. Mine were rather preliminary studies than final pronouncements—but who was I, to speak the " last word " upon any great theme?

In the days when I was young, Carlyle and—influenced by Carlyle—Hutchison Stirling, the philosopher, taught us to write badly. We Teutonized; we preferred being clumsy to being simple and straightforward. That misleading influence, at any rate, has grown weaker during the last fifty years. If it is false to say, with Herbert Spencer, that *clearness* is the *one* virtue of literary style, it is sound truth that clearness is indeed the one merit which is at the command of every writer who will take pains to secure it. Above all things, may we be saved from the man (or woman) who sits down to write with the manifest resolute determination to produce something extraordinarily fine! "There is more hope of a fool than of him ".

Robert Mackintosh.

THE MISGIVINGS OF A MODERNIST.

"Cleeverism" may be described as that temporary or permanent disgruntlement with the customary order and working hypotheses of one's life which sometimes ensues upon the irruption into it of another series of facts and another set of experiences—facts which touch emotions in us which our more usual modes of life allow to lie dormant, experiences which suddenly open up to us wide and new, enchanting or disturbing, vistas of life, vastly other than those we normally see. Readers of Mr. Rudyard Kipling will not need to be told whence the word derives. They will remember how, in *The Conference of the Powers,* three young officers, home from the East, break suddenly, with their first-hand experiences of raw, rough life, into the ordered existence of Eustace Cleever, the popular writer and the adored of the subalterns, and how, at the end, Eustace Cleever declares that his life is little more than a painted show. "Whereupon", concludes Mr. Kipling, "I knew that Eustace Cleever, decorator and colourman in words, was blaspheming his own Art, and that he would be sorry for himself in the morning".

The mood of Eustace Cleever is the mood of not a few of the younger middle-aged modernists to-day. Life itself, with its naked realities and its untrimmed facts, has compelled them perforce to look with new detachment and with a certain misgiving upon the forms in which they have held their faith, and upon what they may rightly hope from it, and disillusionment is not too strong a word to use to describe the present mood of many of them.

It is almost impossible for the younger generation of Christian teachers to realize the liberation of thought and feeling that came to those whose theological thought was being moulded some twenty years ago, and the sense of exhilaration that resulted. Like a clean sea-breeze blowing away the death-like stillness and stupor of a breathless, sultry summer day, modernism came then with a swift sense of invigoration, which sent new currents of thought and motion tingling throughout one's religious life. Almost literally, "all things were made new" for us in those great days. The new thought about Christ and God, and the new understanding of the heart and essential nature of God and of the meaning of life, ran like wine through the veins. How high we pitched our hopes! How sure we were then that we had laid hold of the infallible remedy which would not fail to arrest declining church attendances and the like! For it has to be remembered by those who would blame modernism for the marked slump in the public interest in matters religious that when modernism appeared openly in our pulpits and became fairly general, the tide was already strongly on the ebb; indeed, one might venture to state that the decade and a half between 1890 and 1905 saw

a relatively greater decline in church attendance than the quarter of a century that has since elapsed. Most of our churches were half empty then, and the reason why modernism received so uproarious a welcome from many young ministers, was precisely because it was hoped that it would " stop the rot ". We believed with a *naïveté* which at this distance of time has something sadly humorous about it, that we had but to recast our theological thinking and re-phrase our theological vocabulary, and hey, presto! our church doors would be crowded once more with multitudes of men and women who had been put off religion simply because its theology was old-fashioned and had been exploded by modern science. How could the modern man trained in evolutionary thought be expected to believe in the Fall, in the literal inspiration of the Bible, in the Virgin Birth, a substitutionary theory of the Atonement, and so forth? Whereupon we proceeded to rationalize religion in the conviction that that was all that the modern man needed or desired. Religion became simple commonsense, and whether we intended to do so or not, we left the modern man with the impression that it was all plain sailing, that there neither was nor could be in it either mystery or marvel or anything before which he need bow in the wonder of worship.

Nor ought our present disillusionment to blind us to the enormous service that modernism has rendered to the cause of religion. Many of us would gladly admit that it saved religion for us in those now distant days, for it brought back reality into it. It would be well if those who pride themselves on their up-to-dateness in social thought —and point for proof thereof to the radical criticism of the foundations of civilization which they sometimes initiate, but more often parrot—and are over prone to scoff at religion as eternally lost in self-admiration at its own unchanging self-consistency, could remember that that process of radical self-criticism began first of all with religious thinkers and in the sphere of religion. Modernism was and is at its heart a plea for and a return to reality, a quest for the solid facts that lay behind the current conventional interpretations. It gave us back a real Jesus in place of what to many had come to seem little more than a theological lay-figure; it gave us back a new Bible which we could accept, nor leave our reason behind in the doing of it; it helped us, with its re-stressing of the doctrine of the Divine Immanence, to understand that strange mystery within us, our conscience; last but not least, it taught us that truer ethic of Jesus which has been so fruitful in re-awakening the social conscience of the Church. Small wonder if, bringing such illumination to our minds, modernism seemed to many of us to be nothing less than the re-emergence of essential Christianity which had only to be preached to be believed and gladly accepted. The waters were being troubled, and if we could bring our modern world to them, it would be healed of its infirmities. This was that for which the world was waiting.

nd it would need no very great art or skill to persuade the world
iat here indeed was the very thing for which their hearts yearned.
To-day, all those hopes are sped and dead; time has proved them
) be but " the baseless fabric of a dream ", with no more than a
ream's substance in them. Not one of the issues we trusted would
ccur has materialized, and we can put our finger on some few
efinite points wherein the failure of modernism is beyond question.

(1). It has shown singularly little power to propagate itself as a
eligious attitude to life, *i.e.*, to initiate a really distinctive religious
xperience. It has shown great power to illuminate the minds of
iose who have been brought up in Christian homes, and has helped
iany who have passed through a religious experience of their own to
place " that experience in the rest of their life. In a word, it has
emonstrated its capacity to make good people better and wiser
hristians. We do not whittle down the importance of such service
) religion. But the fact remains that it has shown singularly little
ower to bring God to men or men to God *ab initio*. It can build on
xperience, but it cannot create it. Hence comes the fact that, with
ery few exceptions, the great modernist churches of a generation
go, at all events in the North of England, have fallen on evil days,
nd that, in some cases at least, the track of certain great modernist
reachers say, from 1875 to 1900, can be traced in churches which
njoyed a brief flush of modernist prosperity, succeeded by a genera-
on of struggle and weakness. Perhaps the most damning fact
bout modernism has proved to be the fact that it needs a great
ersonality to preach it, which suggests a suspicion that there is not
nough interest or attractiveness in modernism as such to grip the
ttention of the ordinary man. Its capacity to build up a corporate
hurch centring round either a great religious experience or great
eligious convictions has been, with one great exception, almost
xactly nil.

(2). Nor has modernism betrayed much greater power to work
ioral miracles; indeed it may fairly be charged with taking the whole
roblem of sin too lightly. In right revolt against a too depressing,
essimistic, and totally unwarranted account of human nature,
iodernism has swung to the other extreme in its judgment of it, and
has been in no little danger of a " sugar-and-spice-and-all-that's-
ice " theory of human nature. The truth is that we modernists
ave been incurable romantics in our estimate of human nature—we
ould see nothing radically wrong with it; there were of course a few
iings that needed to be straightened out, but they were of no great
ount or significance; of serious opposition to the Divine Will, of
owness in following it when once it was known, there was nothing.
in was not, or, at the most, it was a regrettable survival from the
ast, not to be taken seriously or to be struggled with earnestly.
mongst the writer's notes of modernist sermons to which he used

to listen over twenty years ago is one sentence which sums up the general tendency:

> It would be an insult if I asked you (*i.e.*, the congregation) to recite the General Confession. You have been brought up in Christian homes; you do not lie, nor swear, nor get drunk, nor deceive, nor cheat. I repeat, if I were to call you sinners, you would rightly feel that the word was an insult.

Nothing could more exactly illustrate the general tendency of modernism to take the problem of human redemption on far too easy terms. The sins to which such a sentence refers are clearly the obvious and surface sins of life; the sentence has nothing to do with the sins that loom largest, for instance, in the teaching of Jesus, and come under His most unsparing condemnation, with pride of every kind, with formalism, with hardness of heart and mulishness of understanding, with deliberate blindness to truth, in a word, with the sins of the spirit.

And as its views of sin has been a little limited, so its proposals for remedying it have been jejune because of its bias to explain religion in purely scientific terms. A science which would not hear of gaps could not tolerate anything like the idea of sudden conversion, nor, tied as it was to the explanation of life in terms of purely natural cause and effect, could it listen with any patience to talk of the specifically Divine action in the re-making of human life. Modernism looked forward to the slow conquest of evil in man and to a correspondingly slow and gradual building up of the new character and personality within the individual. It lost sight, therefore, of the possibility of moral revolution achieved by the working of the grace of God upon a human soul "in a flash at a trumpet crash", as Gerard Manley Hopkins puts it. The new man was only slowly put on, and it was achieved almost wholly by the Divine immanent in man; the Divine that was larger than man and wholly other than man had singularly little to do with the business. When faced with the facts of what looked like sudden conversion, it took refuge in the explanation of it as given by William James in *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, though, in truth, that is a psychological myth of whose untruth the whole story of heathen conversion ought to have made us aware. It was and is this naïve working assumption that there is nothing more in religion than can be expressed in terms of a scientific philosophy that has largely been responsible for the incapacity of modernism to grapple with the conscience that knows itself guilty and seeks, even with tears, to rid itself of its burden. It could in fact have said little more to the Philippian jailor with his desperate cry, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?", than a Stoic would have done, for like the Stoic it would simply have said, "Trust the Divine within thee!", as though the heart of man's moral problem were not precisely the problem of so awakening and strengthening the Divine within man that it may

successfully struggle with that which is not Divine for the throne of a man's personality. The answer of historic Christianity is that that awakening of the Divine within was due to the touch, transforming and redemptive, of the Divine without, that these two are to each other as anode to cathode, and that the moral current only begins to flow and become effective when the two are linked together. It is because modernism has forgotten that Otherness of God, or at least given too little emphasis to it, that when confronted by a moral tragedy it has proved singularly impotent to say or do anything that goes to the root of the trouble. It has had a real message for the good; it has had none, or almost none, for the sinner. Nor can the not infrequent suggestion of the modernist that an acute sense of sin is a sign of a morbid personality be allowed to pass unchallenged; if psychology be invoked and asked to bear its testimony and pass its verdict then it is clear that a refusal to recognize sin may be nothing more than a bit of defence mechanism, by the use of which a man can escape from reality, specifically, the reality of what he truly is. It is not only the ostrich which can hide its head in the sand, or, to change the metaphor, can put the blind eye to the telescope and comfort itself with the delusion that what it does not see is not really there at all. The absence of a sense of sin may in fact betray as morbid an attitude to life as an undue obsession by it, and, for what it is worth, the writer would venture on the statement, born of the experience of half a generation in the ministry, that often our modern impatience with any talk of sin is nothing more than an unwitting mental defence by which we seek to hide ourselves even from ourselves; it is neither more nor less than unconscious moral cowardice.

It is these, and similar weaknesses which modernism has exhibited in its spread and development, that have led many whose standpoint may fairly be described as modernist to ask themselves what it is that is lacking in their faith. How comes it that modernism has manifested a great power to attract temporary congregations, but not to build strong and lasting churches, nay, often has dissolved almost entirely the sense of corporate Christianity? Where lies the secret of its failure to touch the very deepest needs of men?

Part of the answer has already been given—its doctrine of God has not been big enough. It is, of course, impossible to indict a whole movement on this or indeed on any other score, but it still remains the fact that on the whole it has stressed the Divine Immanence almost to the exclusion of the Divine Transcendence. We have already argued that a re-assertion of the Divine Immanence was more than overdue, that the conventional theology into which modernism made its way had so overstressed the Divine Transcendence that any sense of real communion with God was almost forbidden and rendered impossible for thought. And so far, and for many people, it was entirely a healthy reaction. But equally

there can be no doubt that there was an unconscious element in the welcome accorded to the doctrine of the Divine Immanence that was not so healthy, and which in fact defeated the whole spirit of modernism, understood as the quest for reality in religion. For the doctrine came into popularity just at the moment when man was most intoxicated with the vastness of his achievements in the realm of science and most cocksure of his ability to guide his own way in life and control his own destiny. He had explored the stars and had begun to ransack the atom for its secrets; in fifty years he had immensely increased the sum of human knowledge and vastly strengthened his grip upon the universe and his control of its laws; he had bridged the oceans and made the sea disclose its hidden mysteries. All this knowledge he had harnessed to multiply not only goods for his necessities but luxuries for his delight. It is not to be marvelled at if he came to feel, as there can be no doubt that he did, that for the adequate and complete direction of his life he neither knew nor needed any other than himself.

It took the Great War to shake him out of that mood of self-complacency. He was mentally adolescent, with all the impatience of adolescence; he was contemptuous of the suggestion that after all there may be a limit to man's competence to direct his own path in life. There can be no doubt that the doctrine of the Divine Immanence gained such wide acceptance as it did because it chimed in with that widely prevalent mood. It reconciled at once that generation's sense of religion and its new-found feeling of independence; it made room for God without ousting man from his pride of place. So we have grown a generation of Christians for whom sin, the need of forgiveness and the reality of it, redemption and the re-making of human personality, and the Grace of God are phrases of nothing more than an antiquarian interest, curious survivals from the times of darkness and ignorance. It is a generation which, by the strength of its preconceptions as to what God and man are, is prevented from seeing life steadily and seeing it whole. So "the whirligig of time has brought its revenges", and the movement that began as a demand for reality has ended by leaving the major half of reality out of count.

More, a second paradox has developed. As we have urged, modernism gained authority and attractiveness by reason of the fact that it made Jesus a concrete and living personality; it stripped the theological grave-clothes from His figure. That still holds true for many modernists; but a practical acquaintance with the lay modernist mind of at least one section of the movement leaves one with a vivid impression that the current has set strongly in precisely the reverse direction, and that to-day that sense of His reality, nay of His importance even, is being lost. For the emphasis upon the Immanence of God linked on all too easily with Hindu and Eastern

methods of religious thought, in which the concrete personality of Jesus has been dissolved in a thin and unsubstantial esotericism. Hence modernism has shown a marked tendency of late to lose its adherents to theosophy or other forms of occult religion, or in some quarters to give an esoteric twist to Christianity inside the Church. "No modern man", said a lay leader of a modernist church recently, "with his vastly increased knowledge can be expected to go to a Jew of the first century for moral guidance". The spiritual affinity between occultism and modernism, or at all events some expressions of it, is indeed much deeper than appears on the surface. It is not merely that in the doctrine of the Divine Immanence they find common ground, but that, in part, they have a common psychological spring. Occultism represents, in some at least of its devotees, a psychological compensation for an inferiority complex; unable to solve the concrete problems of their own lives, they unconsciously conceal their failure to face reality and solve its practical problems by solving in the privacy of their thinking all kinds of abstract and unreal puzzles. The same thing is true of some modernists. They are smitten with a fatal incapacity to stand up to the demands of actual life, and to face the realities concerning themselves, and they fly for refuge to what is new, sometimes indeed to what is bizarre.

Hence comes the curious paradox that both fundamentalism and modernism have, in many cases, the same psychological roots. The fundamentalist makes his escape from reality by focusing his attention upon what is ancient, the modernist upon what is new. Thus some types of modernist, especially the half-educated type, without knowledge enough to give them historical and philosophical perspective, have not only made modernism a new orthodoxy which automatically bans what has been believed in the past, but, developing an Athenian itch for the novel rather than a Christian passion for the true, have made novelty almost a test of truth. There is what one may call an "Inter B.Sc." type of mind, which is vastly attracted to modernism simply because of its imagined intellectual *cachet*, and betrays a Peter Pannish incapacity to grow up into that intellectual maturity which can rightly judge and balance truth, or, with the modesty of true knowledge, can rest content with allowing life itself to sift the passing from the permanent, the true from the false, whether old or new.

And if the full truth, without which the spiritual poverty of at least some modernist churches cannot be understood, must be told, this type of modernist often betrays a pseudo-intellectual arrogance wholly out of keeping with the true Christian temper. It is a hard thing to say, but it is none the less true, that, substituting modernist for Pharisee and orthodox for publican, the first part of the parable still has its pertinent and up-to-date application. No real account of modernism to-day would be complete which did not

recognize that it builds its churches in part, not upon human strength, but upon human weakness, upon timidity of life, and upon an illicit pseudo-intellectual conceit. We do not urge that such defects are characteristic of modernists as a whole—indeed the really educated modernists are very far from being such—but it would probably be true to say that it is the presence of those two elements which are the chief proximate causes of the spiritual infertility of modernism.

Where then lies the remedy? It cannot be that a movement which had in its origin so large a portion of the truly Christian spirit and outlook is destined to lose itself in such aridity, vagueness, and impotence. To begin with, it is clear that there can be no putting back of the clock, no forswearing of the root principles and methods of modernism. The right of reason to have its say in religious thought and discussion is too well established by now to be easily dispossessed, and we have no wish to dispossess it. The right to judge what is true and what is false, whether it be in matters of Biblical knowledge or of historic or philosophical theology, is a postulate of modern knowledge, and to-day we cannot revert to creeds established by arbitrary authority. Authoritarianism, whether of church or book, may have its temporary successes and win its local victories, but in the long run it will be found to run too strongly against the main currents of modern thought and modern ways to win any lasting victory. A generation which claims freedom to examine facts for itself in every other department of life is not likely permanently to forgo its habits and claims in the sphere of religion alone and tamely accept the authority of others both as to what the facts are and what they mean.

There can, then, be no return to fundamentalism or to anything like it. Indeed, we may say that the remedy lies in the very opposite direction, that we need to be, not less modernist, but more, and that the cure for modernism is a " hair of the dog that bit it ". For, as we have tried to show, modernism has failed precisely because it has failed to carry through and express its own inherent principle of realism in the facing of facts. It has not really faced either the human problem or the Divine, or the relations between God and man. The natural result has been that its solutions have been but half-solutions at best; it has tried to solve its problems on far too easy terms. The whole future of modernism depends on whether it will face the full facts of religion and seek for answers to its questions at deeper levels of life. Will modernism have the courage to disown the facile account it often gives of what human nature is, and recognize the simple and obvious fact that you cannot expect that the instinctive impulses of life, graven deep into human personality through countless generations, are going to be ousted by ten, fifteen, or twenty years in a Christian home, *i.e.*, that sin is a real problem, and redemption a real necessity?

And what of the way in which historically that redemption has been found to take place and have its expression in human life? Will modernism make room in its theology for the clear fact to which all the story of Christian experience bears witness, that it was not by the Immanent, but by the Transcendent God, by a Power not themselves that men have been re-made in strength and grace? And does that not lead us into a further reality of which modernism must take count, the reality of mystery in religion, of that in it which simply will not fit into any purely rational interpretation of life derived from any merely scientific account of it? For the so-called psychological accounts of the re-making of life do not really explain it; they simply give an account of those elements in the experience which can be correlated with similar factors in the rest of our experience, but the *esse* of the experience, that which makes it what it is and nothing else, that sense of the power of God present and active, these elude and escape it. When the soul which has passed through such an experience reads accounts purporting to explain it, its comment is direct and forcible, and invariably to the effect that it is Hamlet with the Prince left out.

It is this deeper analysis of human nature and its need, this larger conception of God and this recognition of His grace as the bright mystery and reality of religion, which modernism must re-capture if it is to recover spiritual power in modern life, for it is these elements of faith alone which can transform it from an ethic into a gospel, from a demand into the promise of certain power by which that demand can be met. Like Anatole France, many of us who are not ashamed to be called modernists would sadly confess that we too have been busy "twisting dynamite into curl-papers", and a growing number of us are convinced that we need a truer vision of both man and God and of the realities of religious experience before modernism can become once more the bright sword of the Spirit.

B. C. Plowright.

THE FREE CHURCHES AND NATIONAL EDUCATION.

I

THE renewed crisis in education is a call to Free Churchmen, not to arms but to think. The question whether the main responsibility for holding up the new Education Bill rests with the Roman Catholics and the exorbitancy of their demands or with us Nonconformists and the niggardliness of our concessions, is a minor one. We may be quite clear that we had reached the limit of reasonable concession, and that we were justified in resisting the suggested compromise with Catholic demands. But before our leaders enter upon further negotiations or undertake any campaign to rouse public opinion, Free Churchmen should reconsider the whole situation. Are the positions we took up in 1902 really tenable in their entirety, and do they form the basis of a constructive policy at the present time?

In our official pronouncements and in the utterances of recognized and respected leaders we are committed to some such statement of aims and principles in national education as is contained in the following summary. Our ideal is a uniform system of elementary and secondary education under public control. We want to end what is known as the dual system which we condemn as unreservedly evil. We desire that all existing non-provided schools should be transformed into or replaced by schools provided, owned, and managed by the local education authorities. (By the way, it is curious to note how rigid this standard of orthodoxy has become in Free Church circles, since the complete *volte-face* on this issue in Free Church opinion about 1870. Up till then, Free Churchmen distrusted State-provided schools and formed denominational schools. It was possible before 1870 to believe in denominational schools and still pass muster as a Free Churchman. But now if one suggests that there may be even a subsidiary place for non-provided schools in our national system, one is to be denounced as an out-and-out denominationalist and regarded as a traitor to Free Church principles).

This demand for a uniform State system of education we defend as necessary on three or four main grounds. First, it is necessary to safeguard the interests of the children of Nonconformist parents. Second, it is necessary to safeguard the interests of Nonconformist teachers and of the teaching profession in general. The profession should be one, and any teacher should be eligible for any post in the schools supported by the State, irrespective of his or her religious belief. Usually we quote Cromwell at this point, perhaps more effectively than relevantly, as he was probably not thinking of education

when he spoke of the State's indifference to the opinions of its loyal servants. Thirdly, we hold that only in this way can we secure the great constitutional principle of "no public support without public control". Fourthly, since the provided schools are in the main more efficient than the non-provided, the replacement of the latter by the former would give us a more efficient educational system. Beyond this, in our programme we include religious teaching. Throughout the State system we want to see such Biblical and religious teaching given as would cover the elements of Christianity on which we assume all Christians are or ought to be agreed, and the giving of which we assume would not involve any invidious religious tests for teachers. With this common background of simple Bible teaching supplied through the State schools, the Churches could then erect their respective superstructures in Church and Sunday Schools. This is our Free Church programme for national education, and we still feel aggrieved that the Liberals in 1906 were unable to embody it in legislation.

A Free Churchman who holds to this ideal may nevertheless have some qualms about trying to put it into operation against a minority which conscientiously objects to it. Assuming that this is our ideal, are we prepared to override opposition by a bare Parliamentary majority? We tried this in the 1906 Parliament and failed. Perhaps we should be thankful that we failed. For unless the dual system is ended by consent, the forcible ending of it by legislation or by administrative action must involve injustice to conscientious minorities. It is true that in discussions on Irish policy in the same 1906 Parliament, Mr. Birrell committed himself to the principle, "Minorities must suffer". But this can hardly be regarded as a Free Church principle. When Free Churchmen desire a strong Government to tackle the education problem on bold lines, *i.e.*, to realize our ideal without any consideration for the denominationalists, we ought to be on our guard. We are in peril of denying and are actually condemning those very principles of respect for minorities on which our own position as Free Churchmen depends.

This consideration applies more particularly to the demand that simple Bible teaching, but still definitely religious teaching, should be given in all the nation's schools, and that only such teaching should be given. We desire to see this form of undenominationalism as the only form of religious teaching legally permitted in any school provided from or aided by State funds. At no point in the whole controversy is the thought of the average Free Churchman more confused, and the ambiguity involved has laid us open to charges of inconsistency and hypocrisy which are difficult to meet. Because this type of teaching is in itself a good and desirable thing, or can at least be impressively defended and commended, the average

Free Churchman cannot see that it is wrong—and particularly inconsistent for him as a Free Churchman—to enforce such teaching on the community by legislative enactment. We may, and in my judgment we should, endeavour to secure the widest possible use throughout the school system of what are known as agreed syllabuses of Biblical and religious instruction. But the adoption of such syllabuses can only be valid by consent—by the consent of teachers and school authorities, by the consent of parents, as well as of churchmen of various sorts and conditions. As soon as we seek to obtain a legal monopoly for this form of religious teaching, we betray our fundamental Free Church principles. We think we avoid this by claiming that this is what we are all agreed on as Christians. There is an ambiguity in this assumption of agreement. Such syllabuses may cover the points on which the outsider can discover agreement among Christians, but, as a matter of fact, all Christians are not agreed either on the content or on the use of such syllabuses, and are certainly not agreed on the proposed division between a common Christianity regarded as fundamental and other elements of Christianity which by implication are secondary. Free Churchmen would soon see the difficulty and the logical weakness of our position if the theosophists were asked on their principles to draw up a syllabus of religious teaching which should bring out all that was common to the great world-religions. Should we then be satisfied that essential Christianity would be covered by such a syllabus, or should we be content that certain elements of Christianity were included in this syllabus, though they were divorced from what we regarded as their essential context? Yet it is just such a form of undenominational Christianity which we propose to establish and endow by law, and we say to the Catholics: "You ought to be content with this. If you are not, you must pay for the State system and run your own denominational schools at your own expense besides". Few Free Churchmen who press for simple Bible teaching at the State expense and protest against "Rome on the rates" realize what they are doing. Our attitude is utterly indefensible on our own principles. In the earlier controversy, Dr. Moberly's tract on "Undenominationalism" was never seriously answered, for the simple reason that we Free Churchmen cannot answer it. It was just because he saw the weakness of the position in the light of our own principles that Dr. Clifford advocated the exclusion of any definite religious teaching from the national schools and trusted to the retention of the Bible as literature to save us from out-and-out secular education. Many Free Churchmen advocate the secular solution, as the only way to avoid compromising with our Free Church principle that the State shall have nothing to do with religion and as the only way to end the religious controversy in the schools.

But the secular solution is no solution. It will not end the religious difficulty, because a vast number of people who care about religion and education will not accept the secular solution. It does not avoid compromising our Free Church principle, as it commits the State to the view that the main education of a child can be satisfactorily divorced from definite and positive religion. The fact is, however, that once the State enters the field of education, the old Free Church principle that the State must have nothing to do with religion necessarily goes by the board and solves no problem.

If this were the only Free Church principle contravened by our demand for undenominationalism in State schools, such a departure from our original principles would not be serious. But that demand involved just that claim for a monopoly of State support and just that overriding of conscientious minorities, the protest against which is the very *raison d'être* of Nonconformity. Nevertheless, we have to abandon or modify our principle of the State ignoring religion, for in education the State and the Churches must co-operate on some terms or other, and these terms may involve concurrent endowment, much as we detest the idea. Certainly we cannot, with any justice or honesty, ask for the endowment of simple Bible-teaching unless we are prepared to let the State also subsidize other forms of religious teaching in the schools if there is a real demand for such teaching.

No feature of the current Free Church orthodoxy on education is less worthy of us than our attitude towards Roman Catholic schools. The slogan, "Rome on the rates", is one of which we ought to be ashamed. The position of the Jews is exactly the same as the position of the Romans, and the Jewish community made exactly the same demands as the Romans in connexion with the present Education Bill. Yet we never raise the cry, "The Jews on the rates". We do not trouble about the Jews, because the Jews are a small community and we are not afraid of them, while the Roman Church is a considerable body and we are afraid of it. Besides, we realize the injustice of compelling the Jews to accept our undenominational religious teaching. So we entertain no objection to Jewish children being taught Judaism by Jewish teachers in State schools with a Jewish atmosphere. But we do object violently to Catholic children being taught by Catholic teachers in schools with a Catholic atmosphere. There is no real principle involved here. Our attitude is determined by our dislike and fear of Rome.

Our dislike and fear are, of course, not without substantial grounds. As a Quaker, my own quarrel with Rome is as deep as any man's. It is not only or chiefly that Rome is sacramentalist while we, Friends, are non-sacramentalist; nor yet that Rome is sacerdotal, whereas we are an experiment in lay-Christianity. But above all we object to the type of authority claimed for and exercised

in the Church of Rome. To us that authority seems alien to the mind of Christ and absent from His gospel-order, contrary to the spirit of the Incarnation, and inimical to the Cross of Christ. So as a Quaker I dislike the existence and regret the extension of any form of education which is in the hands of the Roman hierarchy and which bolsters up their distortion of Christianity. And yet I realize that while I hold this indictment of Rome to be true, it is not the whole truth about that great Church. And when I speak of it as "great", I am not thinking of its size, because greatness cannot be estimated by numbers or organization. I am thinking rather of the spiritual wealth of Christian life which is still the glory of the Roman Church. It is only a surmise, but I sometimes think that the Christian graces of humility and contrition may be better known in the Roman Church than in the Society of Friends, for our besetting sins lie in the direction of Pharisaism and self-righteousness. And, though I know little of Catholic schools, I suspect that there is much real devotion and sacrifice in the working of them. In any case, fear and dislike are bad counsellors, and a reasoned opposition is no excuse for inflicting injustice on Roman Catholic parents and Roman Catholic ratepayers. If Roman Catholic parents desire such religious teaching and such a religious atmosphere as they now find in Catholic schools, and if Roman Catholic ratepayers desire such schools to be provided, there is no principle of justice forbidding the State to fulfil their desires.

Here, however, Free Church orthodoxy advances two demurrers. For the State to maintain such denominational schools is held to be unjust on two grounds. It means, first, that in a profession organized by the State certain positions are reserved for Catholics and closed to Nonconformists. The Catholic has better prospects in the teaching profession than his Nonconformist colleague. Secondly, it infringes the great principle, "No public support without public control". Can either of these demurrers bear a critical investigation? The first is perhaps sentimental. The bulk of Catholics who enter the teaching profession do so in order to teach in Catholic schools. Is their competition in the open market really formidable? On the other hand, with what face can Free Churchmen demand that local education authorities should be put in a position to force Nonconformist teachers on to the staffs of Catholic schools? Yet that is clearly one of the things for which our leaders in the recent crisis thought we should stand out. If Nonconformist teachers are at a serious disadvantage, it is open to us to remedy this by creating reserve-places in schools of our own. We shall not attempt to do so, primarily because we shall see on reflexion that the alleged grievance is not genuine.

The second demurrer involves an ambiguity of thought and

phrase of which Free Churchmen are too seldom conscious. The appeal to the principle, "No public money without public control", only justifies our opposition to State support of denominational schools, in the form, "No public money without *complete* public control". But in this form the principle itself is untenable and reactionary. It is nothing more or less than bureaucratic State Socialism. For the representatives of Independency to advocate what is essentially State Socialism would be foolish at any time, and it would be particularly foolish at a time when the system is being abandoned by all intelligent Socialists. We know that in industry we must secure a fuller recognition of the public interest, we must organize for the common good; but the way to the co-operative commonwealth is not simple nationalization and an extension of bureaucracy, though there must be some measure of public control possibly throughout industry, and we must experiment with varied forms of co-operation between the State and private enterprise. No one would contend that there should be no State subsidies or State credits granted to an industry unless the industry were to be entirely taken over and managed by the State. So in education, there should be some measure of public control throughout our educational institutions, whether in receipt of public money or not. A minimum standard of hygiene and efficiency should be required of all private schools, and secured by registration and inspection. But if State funds are entrusted to any private body, the State need not insist on complete control. It does need effective control. It needs adequate assurance that the funds given for a specific purpose will be used and used wisely and well for that purpose. The actual form and measure of such public control may and should vary from case to case, and may have to be determined by experiment. They cannot possibly be laid down in advance by an appeal to the general principle "No public money without public control", and our Free Church reiteration of this principle is mostly idle rhetoric, a cloud of words covering a refusal to think. There is no reason in principle why grants should not be made to denominational schools, provided the State has sufficient control to see that the grants are properly used. Whether the proposals of the President of the Board to the Catholics secured effective control in the public interest is matter for discussion. Free Churchmen did not approach the subject at all dispassionately. It would almost seem as if many of them took it for granted in advance that any measure of control which the Catholic authorities would accept must necessarily be ineffective. This may be a natural prejudice, but it is scarcely honest dealing.

In the last resort, if we have any ground for believing that Catholics are getting more than their fair share of public money, and if we are still afraid lest any of our own rates and taxes should go

to support a type of education which we profoundly distrust, we ought to advocate the earmarking of rates for the support of different types of school. Some such scheme is adopted, I believe, in Canada, and though awkward and cumbersome, presents no insuperable practical difficulty. So long as we do not advocate this remedy for the grievance of "Rome on the rates", we lay ourselves open to the suspicion that we are more eager to cripple Rome than to do justice.

The reason why Free Churchmen fail to see the weakness of their agitation against concessions to the Catholic schools is that they imagine our case against Rome to be involved in our real case against the Education Act of 1902. The gross injustice under which we Nonconformists suffer is the Church monopoly of education in a large number of single-school areas, particularly in rural districts. Here the usual pleas of the denominationalists only serve to aggravate our wrongs. They tell us, they desire not only Church teaching in their schools, but a Church atmosphere and teachers who shall be *ex animo* Churchmen and Churchwomen. So in thousands of areas Nonconformist children must attend a Church school, with the slender protection of a Conscience Clause, and in such schools Nonconformist teachers have little or no hope of finding a post. It was the perpetuation of this situation by the Act of 1902 which aroused such bitter and such well-grounded resentment among Free Churchmen. But, be it noted, this is not only our real grievance, it is our only real grievance. The existence of denominational schools may be undesirable and regrettable anywhere; they only constitute an injustice in one-school areas. Free Churchmen have from the first exaggerated our wrongs, and they are serious enough, without any exaggeration.

Happily the Church of England is more alive to-day to the injustice under which we labour, than she was in 1902. The leaders of that Church are prepared at least to introduce the agreed syllabuses of religious instruction into such schools for three days in the week, and while Headships are unlikely to be thrown open, subordinate posts may more often be offered to Nonconformists. This is something, though it is not enough. We can hardly be content until all such schools are administered by public education authorities and the Headships open to all members of the teaching profession, though doubtless, in view of their origin, provision must still be made for Church teaching to be given to the children of such parents as desire it. But a half-measure of redress should be accepted gladly, even though we cannot curtail our full demands. In relation to the present Education Bill, while we ought not to insist that there shall be no development in Education until our whole grievance is redressed, we may fairly ask that there shall be no extension of that grievance in the new Central Schools.

There remains still to be discussed the case against denominational schools on the ground of inefficiency. Are we not justified in demanding the ending of the dual system in the name of the children who are receiving a poorer education in those schools than they would receive in provided schools? If this is our main reason for objecting to denominational schools, let us emphasize it. But here too it is impossible to make out a case against all denominational schools or against denominational schools as such. There are many black-listed denominational schools which ought to be closed and replaced by provided schools. In all one-school areas this procedure should be adopted whenever possible. But it is not true that the presence of denominational or semi-private schools in our national system necessarily involves inefficiency. On the contrary, the uniformity which we Free Churchmen proclaim, strangely enough, as our ideal in education may itself tend towards inefficiency. It also has within it a more serious danger. Let the State secure absolute control in education, and it may very easily be used for ends which we Free Churchmen cannot approve. We have only to note what is happening in Russia with a State monopoly of education. The advocates of a uniform system are smoothing the way for such a development. It may never come, and will probably never come; but in any case it is not wise hastily to suppress what may be valuable elements of diversity in our national education system. We ought rather to encourage with State supervision and State support experiments by other voluntary bodies besides Churches. I would have the State, if it was desired by the experimenter, and if there were sufficient public interest in the experiment, support Mr. Bertrand Russell's school, though I think some of his ideas of education almost as pernicious as the Roman. But whatever happens, let us beware of uniformity and not stultify ourselves as Free Churchmen by adopting uniformity as one of our principles!

H. G. Wood.

THE FREE CHURCHES AND NATIONAL EDUCATION.

II.

The Editor has asked me to reply to Mr. H. G. Wood's article. I wish the task had been entrusted to more competent hands. But there is one advantage I can claim over those distinguished men who have taken an active part in recent negotiations. It would perhaps be rather invidious for them to defend themselves against the serious charges which Mr. Wood brings against them. They are accused of inconsistency and hypocrisy. They are traitors to Free Church principles. They are guilty of a slogan which it is shameful to use. Their attitude is determined by natural prejudice, but is not honest dealing. These are grave charges. Mr. Wood thinks that "the Christian graces of humility and contrition may be better known in the Roman Church than in the Society of Friends". He might have added that if the Friends show more love to their enemies, the Romans are more loyal to their friends.

We may accept in general terms Mr. Wood's account of the Free Church ideal of a national system of education under public control. But need it be, as he appears to assume, a uniform system? It would perhaps be true to say that we have been so eager to gain public control that we have not given equal consideration to the development of a national system. Mr. Wood is very afraid of the State

> Let the State secure absolute control of education, and it may very easily be used for ends which we Free Churchmen cannot approve. We have only to note what is happening in Russia with a State monopoly of education.

I have noted it, so far as it is possible to get accurate information. But this Bolshevist Bogy has lost its terror for most of us. Mr. Winston Churchill has made it rather ludicrous. It is a little surprising to find Mr. H. G. Wood trying to frighten us in this way. He should have more confidence in his fellow countrymen. We are probably on the eve of great developments in education. Is it too much to hope, with Dr. Jacks, that having got rid of ecclesiastical control, we may next proceed to eliminate the politician? Education should be as free from party politics as the Broadcasting Corporation. It should be in the hands of educationists. Can we not trust them to save us from a dull uniformity? Prof. Gilbert Murray says that the religion "unconsciously created by Mr. Cowper-Temple is perhaps, for practical purposes, about the best there has ever been". That is high praise. It is rather too high. But it is a fine tribute to what the teachers can do when the task is left in their hands. But

I am not aware that it is the official policy of the Free Churches to reduce religious education to a dull monotony of "Cowper-Temple religion". There is room for variety in the choice of a religious syllabus. There is even room for different types of schools. We want venture and experiment in a truly national system. Surely we can trust our educationists to see to that. But there is no room for the vested interests of ecclesiastical bodies. The first step towards a truly national system of education worthy of a great progressive country, is complete public control. This is not a peculiarly Nonconformist point of view. It is widely shared by educationists generally. The following was written recently by one of the acutest minds in the Church of England, "Artifex" of the *Manchester Guardian*:

> It seems to me that the time has come for the Church of England definitely to retire from the field of elementary education. It is quite impossible for us, if we are to do our duty in other spheres of work . . to keep pace with the demands of education to-day . . So I think that the time has come for the Church of England to say, "We have done our best in the past. We now give way that there may be a single efficient system of national education".

What is the alternative? It is not at all clear from Mr. Wood's article what his own ideal is. Apparently he is in favour of a national system of subsidized denominationalism. Speaking of the grievances of Nonconformist teachers he says:

> If Nonconformist teachers are at a serious disadvantage, it is open to us to remedy this by creating reserve-places in schools of our own.

We shall not attempt to do so, he adds, because "we shall see on reflexion that the alleged grievance is not genuine". We must here interpose, that Mr. Wood grossly under-estimates the grievance of Free Church teachers. He does so rather cleverly by treating it as a grievance against Catholic Schools. But the grievance here is, of course, against Anglican schools. It is a notorious fact that not only are a great many head-teacherships definitely restricted to Anglicans, but when it comes to the appointment of the head-teacher of a Council school, there is a strong bias in favour of the head-teacher of a smaller school, more often than not an Anglican school. Mr. Wood does less than justice to the grievance or to the disinterested fight our leaders have made on behalf of the teachers. Nor is it merely that the chances of appointment and promotion are against the Nonconformist teacher. Far worse than that is the premium upon insincerity involved in this system of religious tests. Not long ago a minister told me of a lady in his Church who was visited by the Vicar and told that if she would be confirmed she might have an appointment in his school. I replied: "I can hardly believe that". He answered, "But it is true". I am afraid it is, and it is horrible.

But what does Mr. Wood really mean when he says, "It is open to us to create reserve-places in schools of our own?" He can only mean that he would establish a system of Denominational Schools. We need not repeat the familiar argument against the practicability of providing schools for all and sundry religions. We shall be content with quoting the definite rejection of this proposal by the Archbishops' Commission:

> It would be a reversal of the general trend of recent policy: it might have the effect of multiplying small schools and adding considerably to the education estimates, central and local; it would greatly complicate the impending re-organization of primary and post-primary education . . . and the greatest difficulty of all in the eyes of many, it would accentuate denominational differences in education.

But Mr. Wood's chief complaint is not against the Nonconformist ideal, but that we are trying to force it upon an unwilling community without due regard to the rights of minorities. That is the main burden of his article. Now here I must say that he is unfair to those who have represented us in recent negotiations and indeed to the official pronouncements of our leaders. We have always admitted that we must start from where we are. We have gone a long way to meet the demands of the non-provided schools. The West Riding proposals to which five Anglican Bishops gave their consent have been warmly endorsed by Free Churchmen. But we have gone much further than that. We have accepted the principle of emergency building grants to non-provided schools. Agreement has been found most difficult in regard to the appointment of teachers and the question of effective public control. "Whether the proposals of the President of the Board to the Catholics secured effective control in the public interest is matter for discussion", says Mr. Wood. Well, really! I thought there was a good deal of discussion on that point. The matter becomes rather personal when Mr. Wood speaks on "honest dealing"! It is sufficient to say that most of those who were present at the critical conference with the President went out of their way to express to our leading representative their sense of his fairness, and his obvious anxiety to arrive at an honourable agreement.

In spite of the aggressive tone of Mr. Wood's article, there is probably far less difference than he supposes between the Church of England and the Free Churches on this question. Neither of us stands where we did. The Report of the Archbishops' Commission opened the way to agreement and the Free Churches have not been slow to respond. If proposals were made, as Mr. Wood suggests, to remedy the grievances in the single school areas, to encourage the adoption of an agreed syllabus, and when necessary to make emergency building grants to Church Schools with a corresponding increase in public control, agreement could be reached. But just when

agreement seemed possible the Roman Catholics intervened and wrecked the whole scheme. Mr. Wood thinks we ought to give way to them. Their demands are just, and who knows, some day the Roman Schools may be our only stronghold against Bolshevism? If it comes to that, is it quite certain that even Mr. H. G. Wood would be happier under a Bolshevist tyranny than a Papal one? He chides us for our fear of Rome. Yet there is probably more danger of Romanism spreading in this country than of Bolshevism. But there is little danger of either. I cannot believe that we are any more likely to build and maintain Roman schools out of public money than Communist schools.

But we are told that it is not public money that is in question. The Romans only want their quota of the rates. Can no way be found to meet their demand? Cannot an estimate be made of the amount subscribed by the Roman Catholic community in rates and taxes to the educational services? Let that amount be refunded to the Roman hierarchy. But the condition must be that they bear the whole cost of building and maintaining all their schools—and must keep to their own schools. There is not much chance of such a proposal being accepted by the Romans, but the calculation would be interesting. It would reveal what an expensive luxury to the nation is our good Protestant principle of toleration.

K. L. Parry.

THE UNSURRENDERED CITADEL.

Within a secret place, too oft' forsaken,
There burns an inextinguishable flame
Guarded with folden and unruffled wings.
It is untouchable, a holy ray,
A sovereign beam that in the solitude
And very centre of great stillness marks
That Presence which the mightiest bow before.
For in the soul a lighted ark abides
As in a citadel that will not yield
E'en to the last dread summons and assault;
And men, in drear and disillusioned hours,
When life's great mint pours out but coins of lead,
Thither repair from Time's discarded glories,
To find, as in a vault inviolate,
Eternal and untarnishable gold.

A. Landon.

JANE AUSTEN'S CLERGYMEN.

HERSELF the daughter of a rector, Jane Austen drew in all her novels full-length portraits of clergymen of the Church of England. That she would not pay much attention to Nonconformist ministers is natural enough, for Dissent may scarcely have existed in the small villages of the South of England in which most of her tales are laid, and in any case her sympathies, though warm and charitable, were not broad enough to step beyond the county families which she so vividly portrays and the Anglican Church to which most of them belonged. Nonconformity was outside Jane Austen's world, and if we were asked point-blank to state whether there were any references to churches other than those of the Establishment in her novels an unqualified negative would be very near the truth. As a matter of fact, there is one brief reference to Nonconformity in the closing pages of *Mansfield Park*. Edmund Bertram, confiding to Fanny Price the story of his friendship with Mary Crawford, relates what that young woman said when she realized that there could be nothing between them :

> A pretty good lecture, upon my word. Was it part of your last sermon? At this rate you will soon reform everybody at Mansfield and Thornton Lacey; and when I hear of you next, it may be as a celebrated preacher in some great society of Methodists, or as a missionary into foreign parts.[1]

There are two interesting points about these remarks. Methodism was creating a stir even in the exclusive society of Jane Austen's people, and the romance of the missionary enterprise, then in its first freshness, had impressed such a society butterfly as Mary Crawford.

But Jane Austen is very much at home with the clergy of the Anglican Church. She was born in Steventon Parsonage, her father holding the living of that village as well as that of the neighbouring village of Deane. Living at Steventon until she was twenty-six, and conscientiously performing the duties that usually fall to a clergyman's daughter, such as visiting the sick and aged and making garments for the poor, Jane Austen breathed the clerical atmosphere as her native air. Her father had doubtless many friends among the clergy, and the keen but kindly eye of the future novelist would miss little when these representatives of religion paid their visits to the parsonage. She observed them both as a friend and a critic, and it is one of the charms of her pen-portraits that they are so true to life. She took care to emphasize the good qualities of the better sort of clergy, and we have the pleasing portraits of Edmund Bertram, Henry Tilney, and Edward Ferrars (a somewhat weaker character); but she dipped her pen in the ink of irony in describing the conceited Mr. Elton, the self-indulgent Dr. Grant, and the fatuous Mr. Collins.

[1] *Mansfield Park*, p. 463. (Collins' Classics.)

Jane Austen excels in the drawing of her heroines—Emma Woodhouse, Elizabeth Bennet, Fanny Price, and the rest—and there are no more living women in English literature than these; but in a lesser degree she can make her male characters real and individual, and with no class is she more successful than with her clergymen. See them through the eyes of our novelist, watch them as they go about their daily duties or seek relaxation in social intercourse, listen to their conversation on all sorts of topics and note their general attitude to life, and these observations will teach us something about the state of the English Church in the opening years of the nineteenth century. At that time the Archbishop of Canterbury was Manners-Sutton, who distributed sixteen livings as well as a variety of cathedral appointments among seven members of his family, and another notable bishop was Watson of Llandaff, who shortly after his appointment retired to a country house on the shores of Windermere and visited his diocese once in the thirty-four years of his episcopate. The historian can supply us with many facts and figures of this kind, but we may get more of the essence of the actual situation from the pages of our novelist than from historical documents.

Those were the days in which the younger sons of aristocratic families chose the Church not so much as a vocation to which they were called by God but as a profession that would give them honourable employment and an assured if small income. General Tilney describes to Catherine Morland the amenities of Woodston, where his son Henry was vicar:

> It is a family living, Miss Morland; and the property in the place being chiefly my own, you may believe that I take care that it shall not be a bad one. Did Henry's income depend solely on this living, he would not be ill-provided for.[1]

This is the usual point of view, and we hear much about the value of livings and the comfort of country parsonages, but nothing about the country churches or the opportunities of service that they offered to the incumbent. Edward Ferrars, another of Jane Austen's clergymen, can scarcely be said to take a high view of the Christian ministry when he relates how it came about that he is still living in idleness:

> It has been, and probably always will be, a heavy misfortune to me that I have had no necessary business to engage me, no profession to give me employment or afford me anything like independence. But unfortunately, my own nicety, and the nicety of my friends, have made me what I am—an idle, helpless being. We never could agree in the choice of a profession. I always preferred the Church, as I still do. But that was not smart enough for my family. They recommended the Army. That was a great deal too smart for me. The Law was allowed to be genteel enough . . . but I had no inclination for the Law . . . As for the Navy, it has fashion on its side, but I was too old when the subject was first started to enter it.[2]

1 *Northanger Abbey*, p. 177. (Collins' Classics.)
2 *Sense and Sensibility*, p. 102. (Collins' Classics.)

There we have the same way of looking at things—the ministry as one profession amongst others—the Army, the Law, the Navy—that might be suitable for a young man of good standing. This judicial balancing of advantages is a far cry from the divine compulsion that drove the Apostle Paul into his vocation : " Woe unto me, if I preach not the Gospel ! "

Most of Jane Austen's clergymen appear to have had a University education. Edward Ferrars winds up his account of his inability to fix upon a profession with the remark, " I was therefore entered at Oxford, and have been properly idle ever since[1] ". Dr. Grant, who held the living of Mansfield, was something of a scholar, though we are nowhere told how he came by his doctorate. Edmund Bertram, Henry Tilney, Mr. Elton, and even the absurd Mr. Collins were educated men, but in some of these cases it would seem as though there were little or no theological training, both Ferrars and Bertram, for instance, passing to their ordination in a singularly casual fashion. The former learns to his astonishment from Elinor Dashwood that Colonel Brandon is offering him the living of Delaford : " Colonel Brandon give me a living ! Can it be possible ?[2] " It is not only possible but a fact, and no sooner has he straightened out his love affairs than we find him settling down in Delaford with the woman he loved :

> With an income quite sufficient to their wants thus secured to them, they had nothing to wait for, after Edward was in possession of the living, but the readiness of the house, to which Colonel Brandon, with an eager desire for the accommodation of Elinor, was making considerable improvements.[3]

Edmund Bertram, more than any other of Jane Austen's clergymen, approached his vocation seriously, and yet we find him in a curiously mixed frame of mind as the time of his ordination drew near :

> Edmund was at this time particularly full of cares ; his mind being deeply occupied in the consideration of two important events now at hand, which were to fix his fate in life—ordination and matrimony—events of such serious character as to make the ball, which would be very quickly followed by one of them, appear of less moment in his eyes than of those of any person in the house. On the 23rd he was going to a friend near Peterborough, in the same situation as himself, and they were to receive ordination in the course of Christmas week.[4]

After his ordination all goes well for Edmund, and it is no surprise to find that he wins the woman of his heart and enters upon that life of domestic felicity which is the final fate of all Jane Austen's heroes, both clerical and lay :

> With so much true merit and true love, no want of fortune and friends, the happiness of the married cousins must appear as secure as earthly happiness can be. Equally formed for domestic life and

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 103. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 284. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 370.
[4] *Mansfield Park*, p. 255. (Collins' Classics.)

attached to country pleasures, their home was the home of affection and comfort.[1]

What sort of men were Jane Austen's clergymen? Can we form an estimate of their characters? Did they work hard and exercise a real influence over the lives of the people committed to their care? Jane Austen is at her best in the delineation of Mr. Elton in the pages of *Emma*, and we have the advantage of seeing him moving about his own parish, which is not the case with Henry Tilney, Edmund Bertram, and Edward Ferrars. What kind of an impression does he make upon the parishioners of Highbury as he carries out his duties as a clergyman? It is only fair to remember that our novelist is depicting a young man in his social relationships, but, even so, it is remarkable that whilst we see him calling on the Woodhouses, dining with the Coles, riding into London, walking in the country, taking part in an outing to Box Hill, and making momentous visits to Bath, we scarcely ever catch him at work. His church and the services held there never come into the story, and we seldom hear him talking on any serious matter: religion is taboo in polite conversation. Mr. Elton pays social calls, and for all we are told to the contrary that might be the beginning and the end of his activities. If we search the pages of *Emma* for evidences of his pastoral labours, the harvest will be scant, but let us glean what there is. On one occasion we find Mr. Elton on his way to pay a call upon a woman who is ill, but he encounters Emma and Harriet Smith coming away from the poverty-stricken cottage. Let us see how his mission ends:

> The wants and sufferings of the poor family, however, were the first subject on meeting. He had been going to call on them. His visit he would now defer; but they had a very interesting parley about what could be done and should be done. Mr. Elton then turned back to accompany them.[2]

It seems a pity that we should be deprived of our one opportunity of seeing Mr. Elton at his pastoral duties, but the sick woman is forgotten in the prospect of more attractive company.

Mr. Elton eventually marries a conceited and vulgar woman who constantly boasts of her rich relations, the Sucklings of Maple Grove; and one feels that any hope of improvement in Mr. Elton's character is gone after his marriage with one whose commonplace chatter can but encourage his own self-importance. We may listen to her as she discovers that Hartfield, the home of Emma Woodhouse, bears a resemblance to Maple Grove:

> So extremely like Maple Grove! It is not merely the house—the grounds, I assure you, as far as I could observe, are strikingly alike. The laurels at Maple Grove are in the same profusion as here, and stand very much in the same way—just across the lawn; and I had a glimpse of a very fine fir tree, with a bench round it, which put me

1 *Ibid.*, p. 477. (Collins' Classics.)
2 *Emma*, p. 81. (World's Classics.)

> exactly in mind. My brother and sister will be enchanted with the place. People who have extensive grounds themselves are always pleased with anything in the same style.[1]

Such inane conversation fell from the lips of Mrs. Elton at all times and on all occasions, and it may be counted to Mr. Elton for righteousness that he never shows the smallest impatience with his wife's silliness; one wonders if he noticed it. We have asserted that we never see Mr. Elton in his church, but the closing pages of *Emma* show him carrying out important duties there on two occasions—the marriages of Robert Martin to Harriet Smith and Mr. Knightley to Emma. After such arduous labours Mr. Elton deserves a holiday at Maple Grove.

Mr. Collins is one of Jane Austen's supreme triumphs. That there ever was a clergyman so completely preposterous is hard to believe, but the caricature is never carried quite beyond the point of the possible. *Pride and Prejudice* was the work of her young womanhood, and the high spirits of youth are evident on every page. Only the wit and humour of a girl could have created Mr. Collins in all his absurdities. His unsuccessful proposal to Elizabeth Bennet—so formal, pompous and condescending—is a joy for ever, and his abject deference to his patroness, Lady Catherine de Bourgh, is incredibly silly. In his proposal to Elizabeth, he is stupid enough to quote to her that noble lady's advice:

> Mr. Collins, you must marry. Choose properly, choose a gentlewoman, for *my* sake and for your *own*; let her be an active, useful sort of person, not brought up high, but able to make a small income go a long way. This is my advice. Find such a woman as soon as you can, bring her to Hunsford, and I will visit her.[2]

One wonders whether Jane Austen is hinting in such a passage as this that the clergy sometimes showed too great a deference to the powers that be. Even in our own time it occasionally happens in English villages that the vicar is too anxious to please the lord of the manor. Squire and parson work hand in glove, the hand being the squire's.

Although the proper work of a clergyman is so lightly touched upon in the novels of Jane Austen, there is in *Mansfield Park* an interesting conversation between Edmund Bertram and Henry Crawford on the conduct of religious services and preaching. Edmund, who has just been ordained, gives his views on the way a service should be taken:

> Even in my profession how little the art of reading has been studied! how little a clear manner, and good delivery, have been attended to! I speak rather of the past, however, than the present. There is now a spirit of improvement abroad; but among those who were ordained twenty, thirty, forty years ago, the larger number, to

1 *Ibid.*, p. 254. (World's Classics.)
2 *Pride and Prejudice*, p. 106. (Collins' Classics.)

> judge by their performance, must have thought reading was reading, and preaching was preaching. It is different now. The subject is more justly considered. It is felt that distinctness and energy may have weight in recommending the most solid truths; and besides there is more general observation and taste, a more critical knowledge diffused than formerly; in every congregation there is a larger proportion who know a little of the matter, and who can judge and criticise.[1]

All this is startlingly modern, including the point of view of a young clergyman that the men of the younger generation are an improvement on the older. Henry Crawford, whose attitude to religion was somewhat detached, is nothing loath to give his own opinion on these matters:

> A sermon, well delivered, is more uncommon even than prayers well read. A sermon, good in itself, is no rare thing. It is more difficult to speak well than to compose well; that is, the rules and trick of composition are oftener an object of study. A thoroughly good sermon, thoroughly well delivered, is a capital gratification. I can never hear such a one without the greatest admiration and respect, and more than half a mind to take orders and preach myself. There is something in the eloquence of the pulpit, when it is really eloquence, which is entitled to the highest praise and honour. The preacher who can touch and affect such an heterogeneous mass of hearers, on subjects limited, and long worn threadbare in all common hands; who can say anything new or striking, anything that rouses the attention, without offending the taste, or wearing out the feelings of his hearers, is a man whom one could not in his public capacity honour enough.[2]

It would seem that outstanding preachers were as rare in the beginning of the nineteenth century as they are at the beginning of the twentieth. Have they always seemed rare?

We may sum up by saying that the clergymen of the Church of England in Jane Austen's day were for the most part well-meaning and well-mannered men of good education, but lacking in religious zeal and spiritual force. They probably fulfilled what Newman ironically described as the requirements of an English parson—"a general good education, a public school, a knowledge of the classics". The verdict of Mr. D. C. Somervell is perhaps near the mark:

> Some of these young men are amiable and some ridiculous, but none of them has anything to do with religion, nor does the novelist ever notice this deficiency in them.[3]

We may sometimes sigh for the good old times when the work of the ministry was not quite so difficult as it is at present, but we need never regret that the days of Jane Austen are gone beyond recall and that her type of clergymen no longer controls the religious life of rural England.

JOHN A. PATTEN.

1 *Mansfield Park*, p. 340. (Collins' Classics.)
2 *Ibid.*, p. 341. (Collins' Classics.)
3 *English Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 17.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

AN EX-AGNOSTIC'S APOLOGY.

Dr. Moffatt in *The Day Before Yesterday* has given us a masterly survey of the actions and reactions upon religious thought in the literature of the generation which followed the publication of Darwin's theory of natural selection in 1859. The tide of Rationalism and Agnosticism, flowing from the scientific teaching of the time, was at its height in the seventies and eighties, but by 1890 it had receded. Christian scholars in the period from 1860 to 1890 had largely succeeded in re-establishing their faith on firmer foundations by a process of discarding dogmas no longer tenable and by a re-interpretation of the basic principles of Christianity in the light of modern knowledge. Alongside the assault on the Christian faith in a long succession of books written by scientific men like Tyndall, Huxley, and Clifford there had been a popular propaganda to the same end by men like Bradlaugh. Bradlaugh died in 1891, about the date when Dr. Moffatt finds the tide of Rationalism at its lowest. The tide rose again later on, notably in the early years of the present century, after the formation of the Rationalist Press Association. The R.P.A. " Cheap Reprints ", which included books by Tyndall, Huxley, Haeckel, Mill, Renan, and Samuel Laing, sold in the ten years or so before 1914 to the tune of about two million copies. Such a diffusion of Rationalist thought, assisted as it was in the earlier years by Mr. Robert Blatchford in the *Clarion*, could not be without its effect, especially on the younger generation. Many young and immature minds were won over to Agnosticism in that period. The coming of the War did not assist matters. It only helped to emphasize the historic failure of the churches to follow the plain teaching of Jesus with regard to peace and war. It is certain that the support given to the war policy by the majority of ecclesiastics estranged many people from religion. And although in the political

field there was a similar failure to uphold their peace ideals on the part of many international Socialists, there was less excuse for the professed followers of Jesus.

The general reaction to the War was not, however, without its exceptions. The writer, brought up until the age of fifteen under Christian influences, in his later teens became an Agnostic. During the War, under the impact of Christian pacifism, represented by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, he was led to join a Christian church. I was impressed by the fact that the greatest word ever spoken against war was the teaching of Jesus, and I thought that I could best serve the cause of peace by joining the Church. I have to admit here, however, that during my five years' membership of a Congregational church, under the ministry of one of the most winsome of ministers, I failed to achieve a real belief in any of the dogmas which appeared to be vital to my fellow-members. Even the bare necessities of prayer and worship, without which no real religion is possible, came at last to be unreal for me, and I gave up all claim to be a Christian, reverting to my former Rationalist attitude. A well-known minister of the Free Catholic movement told me after my reversion that he did not think I should long be satisfied with my position. This proved to be the case, for I have recently decided that my rightful place is in the Church. What finally led me to that decision was the reading of the Rev. Frank Lenwood's book, *Jesus—Lord or Leader?* That may sound a little strange to orthodox Christians; but I will try to explain what preceded my actual decision.

As my Free Catholic friend predicted—he apparently knew me better than I knew myself—it was not long before I became dissatisfied with the arid negations of Rationalism. That Rationalism *is* arid Rationalists will deny. But I am thinking of common humanity, of the sin-sick souls who compose the majority of mankind, thirsty for some remedy for their condition, of those who need to be " born again ", not of the " once-born " type—to use William James's phrase—to which many Rationalists belong. What is there to satisfy men and women generally in the cold logic of Rationalism and Determinism? It is the warm-hearted love of Jesus that meets *their* need: " the common people heard him gladly ".

During the last quarter of a century a great deal has been done to reveal, beneath the accretions that have concealed Him, the real Jesus. As to the historicity of that figure I am more and more convinced, in spite of the ingenious attempts of men like Mr. J. M. Robertson to destroy the belief in Jesus as an historic character.[1] Throughout my Rationalist years I never under-valued the ethical teaching of Jesus—I was in fact a Christian, without a belief in

1 Let me here pay a tribute to Mr. Robertson's scholarly works on many subjects, to which I own myself indebted for a large part of my education.

orthodox Christian theology. When I read Mr. Lenwood's book—a book which I believe will have a great influence in winning the younger generation for Christianity—the obstacles in the way of my full acceptance of the leadership of Jesus were removed. Those obstacles were of a philosophical and theological kind, relating largely to the practice of prayer and worship.

At any time during the last twenty-five years I would have said *Amen* to the famous passage in *First Principles* in which Spencer posits "an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed". That passage has been made a basis for Agnosticism or Atheism—logically there is no difference in the philosophical content of the two terms. The attitude of the sceptic is that one cannot in logic ascribe mode to the Infinite. What one can affirm, however, is that the First Cause manifests itself throughout the chain of causes and effects in the universe. By its fruits is the First Cause to be known, and one of its fruits is human personality. As the Rev. R. A. Armstrong shows in *God and the Soul,* the Divine Nature cannot be lower than human nature, which is the highest phenomenon of which we have knowledge. We have the right to affirm, therefore, that the loftiest personality we know is the nearest we can get to a conception of the Divine Nature. The highest personality that history has to show is that of Jesus. We are justified, then, in accepting His character as a revelation of God, and in taking Him as our leader.

One could not count himself a follower of Jesus without a belief in prayer and worship. Prayer is so natural an attitude for man to take toward the Unseen Power behind the universe—to Him "in whom we live, and move, and have our being".

> Speak to Him thou for He heareth, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—
> Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

Modern theology does not believe in a God whose mind and will can be deflected by prayer. To pray truly is to reach out to the Universal Mind, so that our hearts, minds, and lives may be attuned to His purpose. It has been said that prayer is nine-tenths auto-suggestion. Yes, but auto-suggestion is the method by which God works. And worship is as natural to the regenerate soul as prayer; he cannot but give thanks and praise to the Divine Father for the gift of life.

I know that Rationalists will say: "But how can you possibly believe in God as the Loving Father of the Christian creed in face of all the pain, misery, disease, and crime in the world? On your own showing God, as First Cause, must be responsible for all these things". The problem of the existence of evil, one must admit, is a difficult one. It is not to be got over by such an attempt at a solution as that made by Mill in *Three Essays on Religion,* in which it is suggested that the intractability of the material with which God had to deal is the cause of evil. Mill's God evidently was not the

First Cause. If one believes in Free Will, the existence of sin and pain—at any rate the pain which results from sin—does not conflict with the conception of Divine Love. With regard to pain and disease which are undeserved, I am unable to offer a solution: I cannot explain what part the deadly microbe plays in the divine plan. On that matter I must remain finally agnostic.

It may be asked how the reading of Mr. Lenwood's book finally affected my position so as to make it possible for me to come into communion again with the Church. In *Jesus—Lord or Leader?* I found a very frank and fearless facing of the facts in the light of modern scholarship with regard to the personality of Jesus, which Mr. Lenwood frees from the accretions and excrescences of orthodoxy, along with a fresh presentation of the Gospel. If Mr. Lenwood could reject a belief in orthodox teaching and remain a Christian minister, I saw no reason why I should not become a Church-member again. I might have been a Unitarian these many days. I have always had the highest regard for Unitarianism, its scholars, and its many saintly adherents; but to call oneself a Unitarian is to set oneself in a class apart from the main body of Christianity. I think that the attitude of orthodox Christians to Unitarians is to be deplored. Unitarians, because they accept the leadership of Jesus, have every right to be regarded as part of the Christian Church. It is a great pity that some Free Church Councils debar them from affiliation, and that they have been excluded from the activities of Toc H.

The leading doctrines of Jesus—the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, Love, Forgiveness—give us the key to achieving the maximum of good life. Rationalists have often charged against Christianity that it did not "deliver the goods" that it promised. My answer to that charge is that whenever and wherever the essential teaching of Jesus has been accepted implicitly and followed unfalteringly it has shown itself in saintly lives. I know of no people who live lives more admirable than the best type of Christians—lives predominantly unselfish and loving, marked by "the peace which passeth understanding" and by an infectious goodness. I recognize that many Agnostics also live exemplary lives. Some years ago I had a friend who was an Agnostic and a Socialist. He was the superintendent of a Socialist Sunday School, for which he drew up the following declaration for recitation by the scholars every Sunday:

> We desire to be just and loving to all our fellow men and women, to live together as brothers and sisters, to be kind to every living creature, and to try, as far as we know how, to build a New Society, with Justice as its foundation, and Love its law.

That beautifully simple little declaration breathes the very spirit of Christianity. My friend early in life had cut himself off from church

connexions, but he was a Christian at heart. Born and brought up in a Scotch manse, his Socialism reflected the influences of his childhood.

Dr. Glover in his *Jesus of History* quotes a pregnant saying about Jesus from St. Augustine's *Confessions*: *Sed ex amante alio accenditur alius*. "One loving spirit sets another on fire". It is that spirit which throughout the Christian era has fired with a passion for love and service millions of Christ's disciples. Verily life in our times needs to be touched with that spirit. From the beginning of Christianity the Gospel of Jesus, when it has been preached simply and sincerely, has inspired and strengthened men and women as nothing else can, to live the life of which Jesus Himself is the great example. His Gospel still retains its pristine power to move mankind to love and serve the God whom He revealed.

R. E. Dick.

"THE FOOLISHNESS OF PREACHING".

A THEOLOGICAL STUDENT'S VALEDICTORY ADDRESS.

Let it be admitted that these words are chosen merely as an apt phrase, for it would be grossly unfair to take them from their context without acknowledging, what closer observation of the original words will show, that Paul was referring not to the foolishness of the act of preaching, but to "the sheer folly of the Christian message". It was of the foolishness not of the act of proclaiming, but of the proclamation itself, of which he spoke.

Yet I wish to speak of the foolishness, or rather the limitations or dangers of the very act itself—that act which we have learned to accept without demur as the first duty of the Christian ministry, though I take it to be not so of the called of any other religion. This surely can be done without presumption by one who has not yet taken the final step, as, if these valedictory addresses have a purpose, it is that before we leave we may speak of what is on our hearts about our faith or our calling. I do not wish to speak of my faith.

Though sometimes we may go as far as to feel this, it is not with the uselessness of preaching that we are concerned—it is rather with the conviction that even limited experience brings to us, that it is desperately easy to fail entirely to achieve the true purpose of our preaching. The initial difficulty is to say exactly what the purpose of preaching is. The words which follow the phrase at the head of this discourse are "to save them that believe"—which thought was echoed by Newman in the words which he set as the title to one of his great sermons, "the motive of the preacher is—the salvation of the hearer".

I cannot help thinking that we have outgrown more than the phraseology of these fine sayings—that the average preacher, the sincerely honest one, that is, when he ascends the pulpit stairs has something much less precise than the single word "salvation" before his mind. Perhaps rather his attitude is better expressed by Petrarch, that he is there

> to reach a helping hand to the struggling, to provide counsel for the uncertain, a light for the blind, a hope for the discouraged, and a new heart for the tired.

If, however, that be all that preaching is, it is not of the foolishness, but the downright effrontery of it we should be speaking—especially at twenty-three. What ability have you or I to be giving counsel, or providing light, or extending a helping hand, we who are scarce out of our mothers' arms? What experience of life have we, what knowledge of suffering, what understanding of those things which our scholarship can never teach us?

No—if we cannot speak of the purpose of preaching as the salvation of the hearer, of double certainty is it that it is more than just to give counsel, great though that may be as a work. What then is it?

If Dr. Johnson defined preaching as "public discourse upon sacred subjects", we may not be far wrong in saying that the purpose of it in this modern world is essentially "to maintain and deepen the listener's sense and experience of the sacred". It is true that much of our pulpit speaking goes outside that—that we run over into the realm of teaching, that we discourse and exhort on ethics and conduct, that we engage in systems of theology and philosophy. But true preaching cannot be adequately defined without reference to the sacred, nor the purpose of preaching without reference to the actual experience of the sacred.

If we cannot speak to-day of the "salvation of the hearer", because the term has lost full significance for us, we are at least certain that unless preaching goes beyond the giving of counsel and light and help, and faces people with the sacred, it may be a great work, but it certainly has no right to be called preaching. Furthermore, unless it goes beyond the mere mention of the fact that there is a sacred, we are merely giving a spiritual discourse and stating facts about the sacred, not preaching in the true sense. That is why we were careful to define the essence of preaching as the attempt to maintain or deepen the listeners' actual sense or experience of the sacred. It will be recalled of Arthur, that

> When he spake and cheer'd his Table Round
> With large, divine, and comfortable words,
> Beyond my tongue to tell thee—I beheld
> From eye to eye through all their Order flash
> A momentary likeness of the King.

Discourse on conduct, on history, on theology, on philosophy is undoubtedly valuable, but we must urge that only when our words

are large enough to make people feel the sacred in their own hearts can we be said to have really preached.

It is at this point, if we accept that as its purpose, that we become aware how difficult true preaching is, how narrow its limits in the light of that purpose, how easy it is to stray outside these limits into mere public speaking in which the purpose can never be achieved. It is when we remind ourselves that we are concerned with the deepening of the experience of the sacred that we wonder whether we have ever really preached at all. It is, then, of these limitations thus imposed that I wish to be bold enough to speak, and of the dangers of falling outside them, and so failing to perform our office truly, beginning by reminding ourselves of the words of Goethe that in limitation does the master reveal himself.

The first great danger arises from ignoring the nature of the experience of the sacred itself. This experience is essentially immediate and intuitive—it cannot be parcelled up and handed over in statement and proposition as the knowledge of facts. We may speak about the sacred, we may impart a kind of knowledge of it, but that is a totally different thing from leading men and women to the actual experience of the sacred. It is possible to speak to a congregation for years about the sacred, to inform the people of everything that God can and will do in the human heart, to discourse on providence, on salvation, on grace, without ever leading people to the point where they experience these things for themselves. We are all aware how easy it is to talk fervently about God, to talk to the conviction of the minds of the congregation, and even to the point of pulpit stairs congratulation, without in the least conveying the sense of the living and ever-present God to their hearts. We moderns as a whole are intellectualizing our experiences to a dangerous degree, till we are in peril of failing to grasp anything which cannot be conveyed in formal language. The folly of this must be plain to all; in religion it is simply fatal. But the result of it is apparent in the fact that there is a large number of honest people who are well acquainted with religion and loyal to the Church, but who are quite without any personal experience, or even the capacity for it. What we protest against is not that the pulpit speaks about religious truths, but that so often to-day it goes no further; and that, in the light of our definition, is not enough. This intellectualizing of religious experience spells its death. It does not need a " Fantasia of the Unconscious " to expose the destructive intellectual mentality which has eaten so disastrously into modern life. The intuitive, the æsthetic, and above all the spiritual modes are not intellectual. Spiritual aims are not achieved by the mere process of talking about them.

Religion is a relation, not a belief; it is, therefore, of the heart or imagination rather than of the brain or mind. This can be said without in the least suggesting any opposition between the two. The

danger is that we do nothing to establish this relation, we only talk about it; we appeal to the conviction of mind only and fail to capture the imagination. And it is as true to-day as it was in the days of Lacordaire, when he drew attention in one of his brilliant sermons in Notre Dame to the " sterility of the imagination in the sphere of public worship ".

The first great danger of the preacher, then, is that he presents a religion for the acceptance of his people instead of attempting to make them religious. The difference is absolutely vital to preaching, and cannot be overstressed. We preach that men may themselves experience the sacred, not merely learn of it; that men may not merely accept Christianity, but become Christians.

The second great difficulty of preaching lies in the medium which we use, language. The sacred is a subject for which there is no language adequate, or rather which is too deep and personal for expression in language at all. I feel sure that it is more than a private conviction that it is impossible to speak loudly and confidently of the deepest things, that the deeper the feeling the more is expression denied. It is no accident that the grandest things in life—truth, love, joy, home, beauty have found the smallest words, as if they knew that none could express them. Who can tell in words of the fragrance of the flowers, of the glory of a sunset in the Alps, of the comfort of home? No declaration of our simple human love has ever approached adequacy. But the preacher must try to speak of goodness, truth, and beauty, must try to find utterance for thoughts of the soul and eternal life, must talk above all things of the love of God. Who among us has the face to speak of the love of God? What know you and I of the love of God? Aye, and if the warmth of it has entered into our hearts, is it not the one experience which we could never put into words? It was Lao-tze who said, " The name which can be uttered is not the Eternal Name "; and Clement of Alexandria, " Human speech is incapable of uttering God ". It was the drunken artist in Walpole's novel who exclaimed: " This cathedral is the very place, if you clergymen had any sense of proportion, where you should be ashamed to preach ". It was Mary Webb who told of one who

> in her frightened dreams reached out to something . . . beyond the drip and patter of human destinies, something vast, solitary and silent, . . . which none has ever named or known, something of which men only stammer in such words as Eternity, Fate, God.

It was she who wrote of another saying, " I see summat as makes it all worth while, summat as there's no words for ".

If the experience of the sacred is anything at all it is far beyond those few for which we have language. Those who have the experience know that if they would speak of it they could not—but even if they could they would not.

The second great difficulty of preaching, then, is that we are trying to express in language what there are no words for, or rather what is too deep for words. And great danger lies in the unwillingness to acknowledge this limitation—to acknowledge, that is, not only the inadequacy of language, but also the depth of the true experience. If " intellectualism " is one of the weaknesses of this generation, " cheapness " in varying forms is another. We are turning out to-day masses of people with a definitely cheap and facile culture, people with ready-made opinions on literature, art, and life, people whose knowledge is mere information, people who are often clever critics, but whose cynicism never allows them into the realm of appreciation. These people are in the churches as well as outside them, and sometimes in the pulpit too. They are content with ready-made phraseology, especially if it smacks of the psychological; they are willing to consider and discuss the opinions of others, and to accept some—but the last thing they will do is to earn their own opinions, to coin their own phraseology, and above all to win their own experience. Let the fact that language can never be fully adequate put us doubly on our guard against the careless and cheap use of worn and meaningless and cheap phraseology. And, more important still, let us never give the impression that the experience of the sacred is something which we Christians may have daily and hourly without effort, like cold water. That is only for the saints. To many of us such experience in the true and full sense is about as frequent as it was to Plotinus, who said he had had true union with God four times in six years. The pew would respect acknowledgment of this.

One more difficulty or danger I wish just to touch on, because it refers perhaps more to our discourses on conduct. That is the danger and foolishness of abstraction and generalization, of avoiding the personal and immediate in preference for the impersonal and remote. It is a preference born of weakness. Why do we delude ourselves in this matter? It is comparatively easy to set forth a system of ethics or of religious doctrines which will convince the mind of the average listener. It is easy to speak of loving our neighbours, forgiving enemies, praying for the heathen, of the grace of our Lord Jesus, eternal life, the love of God, justice, truth, mercy, and faith. Men will agree with these things readily and willingly, but their hearts are rarely touched by them—and we preach to the hearts of men. And we have learned, if from nothing else, from the modern popularity of films and novels, that men are most moved by the presentation of flesh and blood. After all, our preaching is to move the hearts of men to appreciation, to understanding, to action; it is not essentially to capture the assent of the mind to abstract principles. We do not want Christians merely to approve of loving their neighbours as a principle, but to show it in action. We do not want Christians merely to agree that there is a sacred, but to experience it.

It is absolutely necessary, then, that the informative, didactic, and philosophic notes be second to the illustrative and imaginative. John Watson urged ministers to read much philosophy, but never to let it appear in their sermons. That counsel is doubly necessary to-day, when the most authoritative statements about God are coming from the philosophers and the scientists. This is an intolerable and impossible position, but it is largely the fault of a Church which will accept anything to bolster up its dogmatic positions instead of insisting that the only guarantee of the sacred is the experience of it. The sacred is intuitively perceived, and immediately; it has no place for " proof ", abstraction, or generalization.

These, then, are the three points that I wished to make. I hope, as one who is still a student, I have not seemed to speak presumptuously or beyond years and experience. I have just spoken of what is uppermost in my mind. I leave College convinced of two things. First, that despite these dangers—that we speak merely about the experience of the sacred, that we speak cheaply and easily of the deepest of all that the heart can know, and that we confine ourselves to abstraction and generalization—there has been given to man no greater office than " the foolishness of preaching ", than attempting to bring the hearts of men to know the love of God. But also I am convinced that had I realized at the beginning the greatness of it and my own littleness I should never have had the courage or effrontery to become a preacher.

RALPH F. CALDER.

THE CONGREGATIONAL CENTURY.

SOME BY-PRODUCTS.

THE broad stream of Congregationalism, flowing through the past century, has carried on its bosom many a precious cargo of things essential to its ministry for the Kingdom of God.

A main stream commonly has many tributaries, and these add to the force and effectiveness of the chief current. Similarly, the directly spiritual work of the Church is not weakened but strengthened, not impoverished but enriched, by subsidiary methods of service. A by-product is not a substitute but a supplement. That there should be any waste in the industrial world is now regarded as a rebuke to the man of science, and a reproach to the captains of industry. That there should be any escape of potential power in the activities of the Church is not less a reflexion on its responsible leaders. The amount of coal used to the horse-power of the machine is said now to be one-sixth of what it was a hundred years ago. Yet responsible men in industry are appalled at the wastage, and they say it is mainly due to the failure sufficiently to utilize the by-products. Is this a parable pointing a moral for the Church? Are we as economical as

we ought to be in the use of our resources? Do we call up our reserves as we should do? Are we sufficiently concerned for the by-products? May not this be a favourable moment for reviewing some issues of this Congregational Century, the by-products of which have been both considerable and extensive.

Just a hundred years ago a young Welshman, eighteen years of age, set out for London, and his start certainly stamps the man. Precisely where he will go, or what he will do when he gets there, is by no means clear to him. On one thing his mind is made up—he means to be a Congregational Minister. He comes to the great city, on what he himself calls a wild-goose chase. He has no introduction from anyone to anyone; with scarcely any preparation (he has not heard six English sermons), nevertheless it is the English ministry he would enter. He says:

> I came hardly knowing anything, but resolved to seek some English College and become an English Minister. Even a coward put in a corner must fight, so I fought and I won. I simply walked up to Highbury College and asked for admission.

Thus Henry Richard became a student at a Congregational College, a Congregational minister, and the pastor of a London Church. Later, he entered the House of Commons as M.P. for Merthyr Tydfil, and ultimately became known far beyond the limits of his own country as "The Apostle of Peace".

It was my privilege to know Henry Richard. His relatives lived in Looe, and he frequently came to visit them, and never without visiting the little Congregational Church and saying a kind word to its young minister. Henry Richard is not introduced here, however, on account of a personal friendship, but because he is a striking example of the by-products of the century, since through him Congregationalism may claim to have made a real contribution to the great peace movement of that period. It is no rare experience in these days to meet a pugnacious peace-maker, and, if we omit quarrelsomeness from the significance of the word, fighters for peace form a useful branch of the Church militant. Certainly Henry Richard was a "bonnie fighter" for that cause for 37 years. As its Secretary, he led the Peace Society in its grand crusade on the platform, in pulpit, Parliament, and the Press. He fought a great fight, and provided shot and shell for other fighters in the great campaign. Those were stirring times for the peace movement, and whether at home or abroad Henry Richard was in the hottest part of the battlefield. He always dealt with fundamental aspects of the great cause. He was out not to hush but to heal: not merely to quiet a disturbance here and there, but to cure a disease which afflicted the body politic and cursed humanity the world over. It is good to know that Congregationalism honoured this man by setting him in the chief seat

of the synagogue, and by placing him in the Chair of the Union definitely identified itself with his life's work.

In the stern struggle for religious equality and national unsectarian education during the century, Congregationalists have played no mean part. Here, indeed, we are surrounded by a great cloud of witnesses—R. W. Dale, Andrew Fairbairn, Guinness Rogers, J. Hirst Hollowell, Silvester Horne, J. Carvell Williams, Howard Evans, John Massie, and many more. These men believed in the "crown rights of the Redeemer", and they cried "Hands off the Ark of the Lord" to kings, statesmen, and politicians. They held that national funds should not be used for sectarian purposes, that the State that made a favourite of one particular Church made victims of all other Churches, and they claimed justice and equality for all. Their labours were by no means unfruitful, and both the Irish and the Welsh Churches have been released from State patronage and control. Such minor streams of effective service in our denominational history may well be remembered now.

Take another field. There is an impression abroad that Congregationalism is not maintaining its Temperance testimony in these days, that we are not living up to the splendid record of our fathers in the faith. Some indeed, are ready to cry, "Oh! for a Hannay, a G. M. Murphy, a William Mottram, to appear in our midst again!". Whatever we may think of the situation now, it is certainly true that, taking the century as a whole, Congregationalists have a fine record on the Temperance question. In all sections of Society there are pioneers and Rip Van Winkles, leaders and laggards, men who know what ought to be done and men who are clever at inventing excuses for not doing it. Happily for the credit of Congregationalism, there have been Sons of Issachar in its ranks, men all alive and alert to an actual existing situation, up early in the morning to see the light coming over the hills long before other sleepy souls were awake, ready to go through the gate, cast up a highway, and gather out loose stones lest others stumble and fall.

Such a man was Dr. John Pye Smith, a well-known Congregationalist and a Temperance stalwart of a hundred years ago. The chief event in the Temperance world of 1831 was a great meeting in Exeter Hall on 29th June, to inaugurate the London Temperance Society. It was a very influential gathering, most of the religious denominations taking part in the proceedings. Congregationalism was well represented, three of its ministers being on the platform—the Revs. Dr. Bennett, G. W. Carr, and George Clayton, while Dr. Pye Smith was a principal speaker. What the grandfather so nobly began, the grandson has splendidly continued through the greater part of the century. Congregational Temperance

has had no more devoted or generous supporter than Mr. Arnold Pye Smith, who yet remains, at a ripe old age, staunch and true to the cause he and his family have so faithfully served. Closely associated with Mr. Arnold Pye Smith, Sir John Thomas and Sir Murray Hyslop have rendered great service in keeping the question well before the Churches. Dr. Alexander Hannay was a true Son of Issachar, seeing so early in life the vital issues involved in the movement. While yet a boy at school in Dumfries, he and some schoolfellows wished to join a Temperance Society recently started, but were told that only adults were admitted. These boys proceeded at once to form a juvenile society of their own. So well did they organize their Society, that it became a most vigorous branch of the movement, 800 strong. Verily it is wise to catch them young, for the child is father to the man. Twenty years later, young Hannay had entered the ministry and was pastor of a church in Dundee. He was soon recognized as a leader in the movement, both as speaker and writer. In 1863 he was a London minister, and was quickly sought out by the National Temperance League, which he greatly helped as honorary deputation to Colleges, Schools, *etc.* In 1865 the Autumnal Meetings were held at Bristol, and two hundred ministers met for breakfast. Mr. Samuel Morley presided, and Dr. Hannay addressed the meeting, urging the claims of the movement on the ministers, the churches, and the Union. In 1868 he read a paper before the Union, and for the first time official action was taken, the paper was published, and by resolution the Temperance movement was warmly commended to the churches. At this time the National Temperance League made careful enquiries to ascertain the number of abstaining Ministers, and it was reported that 532 Congregational ministers were pledged abstainers, a far greater number than in any other denomination. Obviously the time was ripe for definite denominational action, and at the May Meetings in 1874 the Congregational Total Abstinence Association was formed, with Sir Edward Baines as President, and Dr. Llewellyn Bevan as Secretary. Previous to this there was a Friends' Temperance Society, the Roman Catholics had also organized branches of the League of the Cross, and some Methodist Churches were forming Bands of Hope; but Congregationalists can claim to have led the way in this country in forming a definitely denominational Total Abstinence Association. The Association is now merged in the Temperance Committee of the Union, and is therefore more completely denominational than ever.

Reference ought also to be made to that fine Congregationalist, strong man of science, faithful and fruitful servant of the cause—Sir G. Sims Woodhead. The priceless worth of his work for humanity during the War came as a fitting crown to a noble and

beautiful life in the service of God and men. We miss to-day the special type of service which characterized the quarter of a century's work of the Rev. Wm. Mottram, as Temperance Secretary. His personal visitation of the churches, so persistently carried on, was the most valuable feature in a life so honoured and a work so precious. The special value of Mr. Mottram's services consisted largely in this —that he carried good cheer, encouragement, and help to earnest temperance workers in the churches—and at least a little company of such brave souls can be found in most churches. The fact that this kind of ministry is not now carried on is a real loss of influence. Nevertheless, work of great value is being done, and the Temperance Campaign may well be regarded as not the least of the by-products of the Congregational century.

MATHIAS LANSDOWN.

"ABIDE WITH ME"—A REVISED VERSION.

THIS beautiful hymn, which rises as few others do into the region of poetry, refers of course not to the deepening darkness which follows each day's sunset—as most hymn books seem to assume—but to the evening of life. An old man, who has found the words a helpful daily liturgy, has ventured to re-touch them at points, and now offers his modified version to other seniors. Since the *Book of Psalms* was compiled, devotional verse has been liable to find itself treated as public property—a thing to be repaired, for better or for worse. Your readers, being wise persons, may divine the motive underlying each italicized change. These motives vary both in character and in weight. (The original appears rather too plaintive). Some of the less familiar stanzas have a peculiar charm for me.

R. MACKINTOSH.

Abide with me! Fast falls the eventide;
The darkness deepens; Lord, with me abide.
When other helpers fail, and comforts flee,
Help of the helpless, oh abide with me!

Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day;
Earth's *joy must* dim, its *glory* fade away;
Change and decay in all around I see;
O Thou who changest not, abide with me!

Not a brief glance I beg—a passing word—
But, as *Thy wont 'mid* Thy disciples, Lord,
So royal Thou and yet so brotherly,
Come, not to sojourn but abide with me.

Come not in terror, as the King of kings,
But *wondrous kind,* with healing in Thy wings,
Tears for all woes, a heart for every plea;
Come, friend of sinners, and abide with me.

Thou on my head in early youth didst smile;
Nor me—the perverse rebel oft meanwhile—
Hast Thou e'er left; 'twas I alas left Thee!
Now to the close, *my* Lord, abide with me.

I need Thy presence every passing hour;
What but Thy grace can foil *temptation's* power?
Who like Thyself my guide and stay can be?
Through cloud and sunshine, oh abide with me!

I fear no foe; with Thee at hand to bless
Ills *lose their* weight, tears *their embitteredness;*
Where is death's sting? Where *the grave's* victory?
I triumph still, if Thou abide with me!

Hold Thou Thy cross before my closing eyes;
Speak to my heart of welcome in the skies;
Let heaven's morn break, *as* earth's vain shadows flee;
Through life, *through* death, O Lord, abide with me!

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION CENTENARY.[1]

When I was a boy it was my ambition to run 100 yards in 10 seconds. I little dreamed that a time would come when I should be expected to run 100 years in 10 minutes. Not even Malcolm Campbell and the *Blue Bird* could do it! And it is not merely 100 years. It was the gayest and most intrepid of all those who have occupied the Chair of this Union—Silvester Horne of glorious memory—who spoke of the first meeting of the Congregational Union held in Jerusalem, with the Apostle James as Chairman, in the year 51 or thereabouts. Before then men and women who had heard their Lord gladly naturally met to talk about Him; and these little groups gathered together for worship, fellowship, and service were the first Congregational churches. Similar communities were soon formed in Asia Minor and Greece, all of them with a consciousness of the Presence of their Lord which made them independent of all other control. The remarkable fact about them was that while they had a keen sense of direct and immediate communion with Christ, equally keen was their sense of communion with each other—they were all branches of the Living Vine. They had the same Lord, the same Gospel, and the same task. When men read the Bible in the vernacular similar Independent Churches emerged again in England, and as they grew in number they were confronted with the problem how to retain their Independency, with direct access to their immediate Head, Christ, and, at the same time, translate into practice their sense of unity with each other. The complexion of the problem changed with the Industrial Revolution, the growth of cities, and improved means of communication, but it was essentially the same all the time—to retain all the joys and privileges of freedom and, at the same time, to secure the joys and privileges of fellowship; to keep independence and yet unite in co-operative effort.

The Evangelical Revival gave a great stimulus to the movement for union. Men saved by the power of God yearned to take the good news that is in Christ to people afar and people nigh at hand. Foreign and Home Missions could not be conducted to any great extent by individual churches—they had to unite for the purpose. So, at the end of the eighteenth century, while the London Missionary Society was started to conduct Independency's missionary enterprise throughout the world, County and District Associations were formed to spread the gospel at home. It was natural that efforts should be made to combine such Associations into a National Union. Some of them failed, but at last, in May, 1831, 82 representative ministers and 19 laymen formed the Congregational Union of England and Wales with these aims:

To promote evangelical religion;

To cultivate brotherly affection and co-operation between the churches;

To establish fraternal correspondence with Congregationalists and other Christians throughout the World;

To obtain accurate statistics regarding the churches;

To assist in maintaining and enlarging the civil rights of Protestant Dissenters.

Almost at once the Union agreed on a Declaration of Faith and Order as a manifesto to show the things generally believed. There was no

[1] An address at the Commemoration Service at the City Temple, 13th May, 1931, broadcast on the National programme of the B.B.C., slightly abbreviated in delivery.

attempt to impose a creed either then or subsequently, and yet it is remarkable how near an approach to unanimity in doctrine there has always been. Almost at once, too, a Hymn Book was compiled.

Two beacons guided these early years: the Scriptural basis of Independency, and the Voluntary Principle. These Independents would have no connexion with the State, and no control by Bishops or Synods. They were not afraid of the New Testament word "Bishop", but they declined to acquiesce in its use in a non-New-Testament sense. So, at the height of the Tractarian Movement, when the Union sent a letter to the churches, it was addressed to "The Bishops and Deacons of the Independent Churches". In the words of Algernon Wells, the first, and perhaps the greatest, of the Union's official Secretaries:

> To priests we must oppose preachers. Instead of sacraments, we must exhibit truth as the great instrument of salvation. In place of a blind confidence in rites, we must teach men salvation by faith in Christ. We must contend for the life of religion in the soul, produced by the power of the Spirit, as opposed to a mere routine of forms, with whatever solemnity administered, with whatever scrupulosity observed, with whatever pretensions recommended.

Wells came to the meeting when the Union was formed doubting whether a larger Association than that for a County should be established. He was convinced, and to his wise and skilful leadership the survival of the Union in its early years was certainly due. Year by year its Assemblies met in London in May, and from 1839 each autumn in a provincial city. Invariably Wells stated the case for Union, showing how it did not interfere with the independence of the individual church, and what it enabled the united churches to accomplish:

> Liberty is the first great element of human power—the liberty that consists in security of rights, and freedom of action. Union is the second great principle of power among mankind, in which many combine, and act together with concert, with counsel, and with order. Together, liberty and union in due combination and balance, form the perfectness of social force. Liberty without union enfeebles by scattering and dividing. Union without liberty only employs the force of those already enslaved, for enslaving others; but when men are free, they are strong for good, and only for good. This is the theory of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It would combine liberty and union. It would constitute a free union—a union of Churches severally free and no less free when united. It would make those churches strong in liberty, union, and love; but strong only for truth and charity; a union that could do nothing against the truth, but only for the truth; a union whose first act of usurpation would dissolve and terminate its existence.

Alexander Hannay's (Secretary 1870-1890) is the next outstanding name in the century. His statesmanlike policy resulted in the formation of the Church Aid and Home Missionary Society, an endeavour so to organize the resources of the churches that the help of the strong could speedily be afforded to the weak.

Sometimes the Union has attempted to carry a load too heavy for it, as when it tried at one and the same time to run Missions at home, in Ireland, and in the Colonies, to raise a large Fund for building Day Schools, and to control periodical magazines, as well as to fight to secure civil and religious freedom. But there have always been men to call the Union back to first things, as Joseph Parker did in 1876:

> What an amazing amount of so-called "business" we have to do! We have to disestablish the Church, modernize the Universities, rectify the policy of School Boards, clear the way to burial-grounds, subsidize magazines

sell hymn-books, play the hose upon Convocation, and generally give everybody to understand that if we have not yet assailed or defended them, it is not for want of will, but merely for want of time.

Always the orbit of the Union has been round the two foci—the freedom of the individual church, and the fellowship of the churches with one another. If, at times, the tendency has been to overlook the former, there have invariably been those, like Baldwin Brown, to sound the warning bell:

> I dread when I hear about "the Church". I think of prelates, priests, tithes, law-books, sacraments, and spiritual persons and orders. When I hear about the churches, the little households of Christ, my heart is uplifted . . .
>
> The breath of our life is the play of the living Spirit through the free thought and action of our individual Independent churches. Maintain that in full vigour as the vital core, and then develop and organize as you will. But we must maintain at all hazards the entire independence of the churches of all but brotherly guidance and influence. Harden into an Independent body, you may look larger and stronger, and may make a more monotonous order in your house of life. But you may write "Ichabod" on your temples; your strength has departed, your glory is gone.

If, at other times, stress on independence has been inclined to lead to isolation, the claims of the poorer churches, our traditional belief in a learned ministry, and the need for its adequate maintenance, have invariably brought the churches together.

If anything is to live, we are told, it must be organized, and yet organization kills it. The Congregational Union, to a greater degree than any other social or political organization, has shown that you can combine and co-operate, and yet give the associating units freedom. The British Commonwealth has the same problem; the political Party, with its local organizations, the same. Will anybody say that either of these has had a greater degree of success than the Congregational Union, now well-organized, with large funds for the aid of poorer churches, yet with associated County Unions independent and self-determined, and 3,000 free and autonomous churches?

I have chosen to outline the history in the light of this experiment rather than to give a chronological summary. The rest of the acts of the fathers of the Union, are they not written in the book of the Centenary History published this week? Of the story since 1900 I have said nothing, except by implication, for Dr. Jones is to speak in a moment, and of those years he can rightly claim *quorum magna pars fui.*

And what shall I more say? For the time will fail me to tell of Thomas Wilson and his son Joshua, of Josiah Conder and George Barrett, of John Blackburn and John Campbell, of R. W. Dale and Guinness Rogers, of A. M. Fairbairn and P. T. Forsyth, of Haworths and of Spicers, of Gerard Ford and Halley Stewart, who, through faith, built chapels, compiled hymn-books, edited newspapers, illumined mind and conscience, stood for Independency, served the churches, made strong men stronger.

It is a magnificent record, full of steadfast devotion and loyal service. It is a great heritage into which we enter, a high calling to which we are called. That our witness may be even more powerful, our story still more glorious, we dedicate ourselves anew to-day.

ALBERT PEEL.

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS.

SOME RECENT WORK ON THE GOSPELS.

I.

In the general acceptance of the Two-document hypothesis Synoptic criticism reached the terminus of an "assured result". But it was inevitable that this terminus should prove to be not really such, but rather a starting-point from which fresh journeys might be attempted into much hitherto unsurveyed territory. Three lines can be traced along which further possibilities were pursued. To begin with, there were those like Wendling, J. Weiss, and Hoffman, who sought to recover from our *Mark* the earlier form or forms in which it had once existed. In the second place, attempts were made to fix more precisely the sources on which *Matthew* and *Luke* drew for such of their material as is not derived either from *Mark* or from "Q". Perhaps the most notable piece of research in this field is Canon Streeter's *The Four Gospels*.

A third course, however, still presented itself. It was that of forsaking the beaten track of literary criticism and venturing forth once more into that open country of oral tradition which the two-document hypothesis had almost taught us to regard as forbidden soil. The group of German scholars which has come to be known as the Form-historical School has set itself this task, and while its gains are probably not as abundant as it would like us to believe, its representatives have by no means returned empty-handed. It goes to work with methods taken over from other studies, in particular with a view of religion which stresses rather the worship and activity of the community than the inner experience of the individual, and with the application to the *New Testament* of laws which are claimed to be in operation in folk-lore and in popular narrative generally. It is the purpose of the present article to offer a brief account of this School.

What may be called its working hypothesis is that the Synoptic Gospels are not to be regarded as literary creations with "authors", in the modern sense of the term; they originated from and are intended for the common people. The function of *Mark*, on this view, was that primarily of a collector, and the narratives, sayings, *etc.*, which he handled are to be interpreted as traditions circulating in the Christian community of his time. What lies behind our earliest Gospel, therefore, is just a number of isolated sayings and separate incidents. We have evidence of this in something with which we are all familiar. When we read the Gospels in church we tear a paragraph or two out of their context, and they suffer no damage: repeat the experiment with Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, and see what happens! The difference is that between a collection of anecdotes and a biography, and our Gospels belong definitely to the former type, not to the latter.

II.

The simplest treatment of the Form-historical School is that which sacrifices chronological sequence to logical order. The fundamental thesis of the school—the fragmentary, disconnected character of the earliest tradition—was worked out in detail by K. L. Schmidt (*Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, 1919), while Dibelius, Bultmann, and Bertram developed

it in their own particular directions. Dibelius follows two lines of investigation, the analytic, by which he seeks to classify the Marcan material under various heads, and the constructive, which aims at showing, from what is known of primitive Christianity, how just such types were needed as have been elicited from *Mark*. Bultmann, again, is purely analytic, and endeavours to discover the few sayings which formed the starting-point of the whole development, while Bertram stresses the influence of the cult.

Schmidt subjects the text of the Synoptics, more particularly of *Mark*, to a most painstaking investigation, paragraph by paragraph, to test whether the connexion before and after is to be regarded as of equal value with the content, or is editorial in character. The conclusion at which he arrives is that what lay before *Mark* was merely a number of individual narratives, anecdotes of the Master, if you will. To these he gave a framework of his own, attempting to construct an itinerary of Jesus in which each would find a place. *Matthew*, on the other hand, just strings incident to incident, saying to saying, while *Luke* claims to have constructed out of them a genuine historical account—a claim, unfortunately, which cannot be substantiated. Hence to this day, anyone wishing to write a life of our Lord will follow *Mark* and *Luke*, while if we want a Gospel to read in church, we have recourse to *Matthew*. The Passion-narrative, to be sure, stands somewhat outside of this scheme. Though *Mark* has not by any means abstained here from the exercise of an editor's privilege, he is clearly employing an earlier account known to him as a whole. If one may say so, he was familiar with a "Martyrdom of Jesus" and has added to it his compilation of the " Acts of Jesus ".

In a further study (*Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte*, 1923), the same writer seeks for analogies between our Gospels and other specimens of popular literature, and finds the closest parallels in the legends of Francis and other saints, and especially in the Jewish accounts of the Great Maggid and his followers. In other words, we must think of the Gospels as a collection of anecdotes circulating among the followers of One Whose person, even in His lifetime, was the object of religious regard and veneration.

There is significance in the fact that this essay forms part of a volume dedicated to Gunkel, for to no one is the school more indebted than to the great *Old Testament* scholar. It is indeed little more than the application to the Gospels of methods employed by him in his *Genesis*. He went behind the results of Pentateuchal criticism and its written documents, tracing the growth in oral transmission of the individual stories embedded in the book, insisting that it was with these "small unities" that we must work. In the case of each one of them, criticism must ask after its *Sitz im Leben*, its point of contact with the social life amid which it arose.

It is with this very slogan of *Sitz im Leben* that Dibelius (*Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 1919) approaches the Gospels. He offers us a very attractive, but hardly a satisfactory, picture of the growth of the early Christian community and the parallel formation, stage by stage, of a tradition corresponding to its requirements. As a later work of his shows (*Evangelium und Welt*, 1929, first appeared as *Geschichtliche und übergeschichtliche Religion im Christentum*, 1925), he works with a theory according to which religion is primarily a relation to eternal reality, but historical necessity imposes upon it a relation to the "world" and decides the forms which it assumes from time to time. "In the beginning was the preaching"—the earliest Christianity was a missionary message. What the content of that message was is shown by such passages as *Acts*

$10^{36\text{-}43}$ and *1 Cor.* $15^{3\text{-}8}$. All hinged upon the Cross and Resurrection, but allusion was made also to the Galilean Ministry, more especially to the miracles, and even the figure of John the Baptist might be introduced. In this missionary preaching the Passion-story will have appeared as a continuous narrative, and that for two reasons. It formed the basis for the message of salvation, and it met the need for an apologetic on behalf of a religion which centred round one who had so recently suffered as a criminal. But the deeds of the Master were of no such vital concern, and came into the picture merely as examples of His power and as illustrations to be used by the preacher.

Dibelius singles out seven incidents in *Mark* which will have served originally as illustrations, and to which he gives the name "paradigm". They are $2^{1\text{-}12,\ 18\text{-}22,\ 23\text{-}28}$, $3^{1\text{-}6,\ 20,f,\ 31\text{-}35}$, $10^{13\text{-}16}$, $12^{13\text{-}17}$. Each story bears the mark of having existed at first in isolation; it is rounded off at the beginning and end, and has its whole point in a saying of Jesus. Attention is concentrated upon Him, and other figures appear merely as representing classes and types, while the style of the whole obviously aims at edification. We have fallen here upon the earliest stratum of the tradition, though an admixture of secondary elements is not to be denied. But Dibelius has no hope of being able to work back from these "paradigms" to still more primitive forms, the historical accuracy of which would thereby be guaranteed. All that we know is, the nearer we are to this paradigm type, the nearer to the actual event. I must confess, however, that I do not yet see what there is in these seven paragraphs which marks them out as more adapted for the purpose of the preacher than others. They certainly do not represent those sections of the Gospel to which a missionary to-day would most readily turn for illustrations. Judging by my own experience, I should think that he would find the miracle-stories most useful, and I suspect that it was the same in the first century. We have no evidence that the Sabbath question was such a burning one as this selection would pre-suppose, and one does not imagine that missionary enthusiasm would find itself at home in the atmosphere of such a story as that of the rubbing of the ears of corn on the Sabbath day.

We may say that, for Dibelius, the paradigm is the nearest we can get to a pure expression of the Christian spirit, still unaffected by its contact with the "world". The influence of the environment makes itself felt at the second stage. Alongside of the preacher with illustrations drawn from the life of the Master, there now arises the "teacher" with a fund of stories in which Jesus figures as the great wonder-worker and is described in features common to contemporary narratives of the same type. There are eight of these in *Mark*—$4^{35\text{-}41}$, $5^{1\text{-}20,\ 21\text{-}43}$, $6^{35\text{-}44,\ 45\text{-}52}$, $7^{32\text{-}37}$, $8^{22\text{-}26}$, $9^{14\text{-}29}$. All these betray an interest in narrative for its own sake, and employ "secular" features; yet they are strongly religious in interest, for their theme is the power of Jesus as One sent from God.

Mark pieces together these paradigms, tales, and various other elements in the tradition as known to him. He introduces local and chronological notices, and adds a few composite narratives of his own to fill up gaps. Most important of all, he groups and so interprets all this material in the light of his theory of the "Messianic secret". "Jesus was the Son of God, but He did not reveal to the people what He was". Miracles and parables alike are "a manifestation of the Divine in the world, but only for the elect, to whom it is given to see the mystery of God's Kingdom" *Mark* is "a book of the mysterious Epiphany".

But what of the "Sayings?" On this Dibelius has but little to say. As soon as the Christians had gone out into the "world"—so runs the

theory—there was need of definite ethical instruction. For this, three sources were available, current Jewish teaching, remembered sayings of the Master, and the exhortation given in the community from time to time by its Spirit-filled members. The collection we call "Q" is the deposit of all three. *Mark* took up such bits of the teaching-material as served his purpose, *Luke* worked it into his account, and *Matthew* made it the main element in his Gospel, in the form of complete discourses. Thus *Matthew* is the first "Gospel" in our sense of the term, for it is thanks to it that a book became the substitute for preaching, and literary composition took the place of oral transmission.

The last stage of all was reached when Christianity met the "religious romanticism" of the time, and produced its own mythology. Jesus was at first a teacher, now He became a God walking among men, dying and rising again. This mythical element is a sure sign of lateness, and is absent from the earliest Gospel, except in the form of the editor's *Messiasgeheimnistheorie.* Stories such as those of the Baptism, the Transfiguration, and the Empty Tomb are dominated by this "myth-making tendency", while the soliloquy of Jesus in Matt. $11^{25\text{-}30}$ makes Him speak like one of the Saviour-Gods of Hellenism. But the final triumph of this movement away from tradition rooted in fact to myth created by faith is to be seen in the Fourth Gospel. Is there not room here for more caution? That the Jesus of the earliest accounts was only a teacher is, as we shall see, a view which Dibelius himself expressly repudiates elsewhere. One Whom His disciples could not but salute as Messiah was surely the kind of figure about whom "legends" might well have gathered, and whose deeds might well have been re-told as "myths" even in His lifetime. For He actually did the things which are the raw material of legend and myth and dogma.

In his perhaps too thorough-going *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (1921), Bultmann abandons the constructive half of Dibelius's method in favour of a more systematic and drastic employment of the analytic. At the same time, he enlarges the field of enquiry by a fuller consideration of the later, even of the apocryphal, Gospels, while frequent use is made of analogies drawn from Rabbinical and Hellenistic literature. A second difference between the two is that the teaching-material, neglected by Dibelius, comes with him into the foreground. Their terminologies differ, but Bultmann's "apothegm" is much the same as the other's "paradigm".

Bultmann's contention is that the content of our Gospels derives ultimately from a small number of sayings, of which only a few can be traced back to our Lord with a fair degree of confidence. Stories of what Jesus had done, of controversies with opponents and instructions to disciples, grew up gradually around these, by processes of combination, expansion, and the addition to them of extraneous material. In the same way, when we come to the miracle-stories, a certain minimum of fact may be admitted as a starting-point, but the real work is done again by these three processes, especially in this case by the carrying over to Jesus of features derived from the *Old Testament,* or from Jewish or Hellenistic sources. A third class of stories must rank as "legends", for in them the early Church gives expression to its faith, and here we meet some of Dibelius's "myths" under their new name. The Passion-story, to be sure, falls into a category of its own, but it, too, is an instance of the amplification of originally quite slender materials.

The consequences of this treatment of the documents amount to a scepticism which seems almost ruthless at times. Our Gospels belong, we are told, not to literature at all, but to the history of dogma and the

cult! Bultmann does not so much analyse as pulverize, breaking everything up into tiny fragments. One might almost say that he offers us an "atomic theory" of early Christianity; even a verse is frequently too large a unity to be able to pass his relentless scrutiny. He undertakes a most detailed and elaborate classification of the sayings, but I am not sure that it is of any more value than an attempt to account for human life by a classification of the bones in the skeleton. Nor are incidents derived from sayings in a very satisfactory way. The theory is that an originally independent saying has been provided with a context and thus a story has been created. If, now, the two do not quite fit, the conclusion is drawn that they do not naturally belong together, and the incident is therefore a later production of the editor's. On the other hand, if the saying fits perfectly into its setting, the argument then is that such an agreement is too good to be true, the whole thing is an "ideal scene"!

Dibelius and Bultmann both speak of the importance of the cult as one factor in the growth of the tradition. Bertram inclines to regard it as the sole factor in operation. In *Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult* (1922), he traces this influence in every detail of the Passion-story. The early Church saw its Master in the light of the Resurrection and transformed the earthly Jesus into the heavenly Christ. In *Neues Testament und historische Methode* (1928), he extends his consideration over a wider area. It would be important to know how the teaching fits into his scheme, but of that we are told nothing. He finds in the Gospels prophet-legends, the background of which is not specifically Christian but is furnished by the *Old Testament* faith in God, and Cult-narratives, in which the figure of Jesus occupies the centre. Curiously enough, while the former are characterized as "pre-Christian Jesus-legends" (surely a phrase which ought not to be used without some explanation!), those in which our Lord appears clothed in the "numinous" are carried back to the immediate impression made upon the first disciples! There seems to be some understanding here of the fact that an explanation in terms of the cult cannot be carried right through, and there must be some residuum of hard fact on which to base the cult.

The work of this school has not gone uncriticized. Burton Scott Easton's treatment in his *The Gospel before the Gospels* (1928) is too accessible to need any treatment here. An able summary of the relevant literature has been provided in French by Goguel in his brochure, *Une Nouvelle Ecole de Critique Evangélique* (1926). Fascher in *Die formgeschichtliche Methode* (1924) argues that the new method has its roots in earlier types of Synoptic criticism, that it is a mistake to think that any mere docketing of paragraphs as belonging to this or that literary or pre-literary type will carry us far, and, above all, that it has erred in the direction of over-scepticism. The same note is struck by Köhler (*Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Neuen Testaments,* 1927). He points out the fallacy of carrying over to the Gospels methods which have been tried out in the study of *Genesis.* Whereas the *Genesis*-stories are "free creations" with centuries in which to develop, the changes undergone in course of oral transmission have, in this case, all to be crowded into some forty years between the Crucifixion and the composition of *Mark.* He rightly says that Bultmann's usual procedure is to assume a section in the Gospels to be unhistorical and then to ask how it can be accounted for.

III.

There are certain theses characteristic of this group of critics, and perhaps a brief treatment of these is called for.

1. To begin with, it is claimed that in the form-historical method there is a key which will unlock many doors that have hitherto remained closed. I am not sure that this can be proved. Indeed, a good deal of the work which has been done, able as it undoubtedly is, has been vitiated by the fact that classification has been accepted for explanation. To use a phrase of Schmidt's, analogy has been mistaken for genealogy. Bultmann in particular provides us with a brand-new nomenclature and a very serviceable system on which to index the contents of our Gospels, but I doubt whether the discussion of forms will ever carry us much beyond that. Again, how much is implied in some of the terms which are employed? No doubt, such descriptions as "myth", "legend", "ideal scene", taken in their strict scientific sense, merely tell us to what class certain incidents belong, and pronounce no judgment on their historical value. If that is so, do they really take us anywhere in particular? But if, as one suspects, these words really conceal an adverse historical judgment, something very like begging the question is going on and the sooner it is abandoned the better.

2. The sociological theory of religion is one of the pillars on which the structure rests. The discussion of that theory may well be left to specialists, but I think we know enough to make us very doubtful whether the New Testament can usefully be interpreted by its means. For these writers, *e.g.*, almost the whole weight of the Synoptic material is borne by the early Christian Church; the tradition, in the main, has been created by it in accordance with its needs, and it is the community which is responsible for clothing a teacher with the attributes of divinity. I can only say that experience of the Mission-field to-day leaves me more than doubtful of such a reconstruction. What missionary has ever met a Christian congregation, above all one recently won from heathenism, which could produce this sort of collective religious genius, enabling it to re-cast not merely the form, but sometimes the substance also, of what it has received? Slavish adherence to authority is much more likely than creative originality. That this was so in the Apostolic Age is proved up to the hilt by the Pauline correspondence. This shows us the Hellenistic-Christian communities, not as boldly adapting their faith to enable them to win the heathen world, but as in danger of falling back to a type of teaching which claimed to be more orthodox, more Jewish, and—this is significant—more in touch with "the historical Jesus".

3. Nor is it possible to see in the cult and public worship such a power as the Form-historical School would have us believe. Is religion in its social, not to mention its institutional aspect, ever an innovating force and not always merely a conserving one? Would not the early Church as a worshipping community be precisely like the modern one, guarding jealously every scrap of tradition and repeating old words even when it had to put a new meaning into them? As a matter of fact, the condition of our Gospels, with stories like those of the cursing of the fig-tree, the Gadarene demoniac, and the Syrophœnician woman, suggests that we are dealing, not with something which the community produced to meet its needs, but with something which it felt it had to preserve faithfully, even though there were things in it which were quite inexplicable and perhaps definitely a hindrance to faith.

4. On two points, however, the school has something of permanent value to contribute. It has established the fact that the Gospels are not literary compositions but compilations of earlier and fragmentary material. Each paragraph must be approached as a self-contained unity before we

ask after its place in any larger whole. Further, the Marcan hypothesis, in the sense that *Mark's* order can be taken as a reflexion of the actual course of events in our Lord's life, has gone. It is all to the good, indeed, that we need no longer struggle to construct an impossible scheme which will account for those journeys to and fro across the Lake. But we need not carry our doubts too far. The main framework which *Mark* constructs—Baptism and Temptation, Galilean Ministry, Peter's Confession, the Journey to Jerusalem, and the Last Days—all these fit so well the picture of Jesus that they must have belonged together from the beginning. So that if we cannot write a " Life of Jesus ", we can still pick out the salient features of His career.

5. Here, indeed, we touch on the point at which most people will feel that a great deal, perhaps everything, is at stake. The historical Jesus, we are told, is so mixed up with the Church's thoughts about Him that He is for ever irrecoverable. "Jesus as they saw Him" is known to us, but of the "Jesus of history" we cannot really speak. Bultmann (*Jesus*, 1928), and Dibelius are of one mind here. That Jesus lived we can be confident, but beyond that we know practically nothing of Him. The earliest stratum of tradition yields a complex of ideas over which it names His name, and probably these do actually go back to Him, but whether they do or not is of little importance, we are told. Bultmann suggests that some might find it convenient to put the name "Jesus" between inverted commas to show that we are using it in the same way as that in which we speak of "Homer", *i.e.*, as a convenient symbol for that mass of material which is universally associated with his name. Dibelius bids us first to remove all ungenuine accretions and treat what is left as from Jesus. It matters little, he urges, whether a particular saying is from Him or from His followers, as what belongs to a later period may still be as true to His spirit as what is unquestionably His. True, but how are we to know when something is true to His spirit unless we have some sort of standard with which to work?

The onus of proof lies with those who tells us that the kind of enquiry which has succeeded elsewhere will yield nothing in this case. Such a book as Oldenberg's "Buddha" shows clearly enough that the main features of a historical figure belonging to remote antiquity need not be lost to us, even though he is known to us only through the accounts of believers and in the language of a cult. To be sure, we cannot hope to find Jesus in the sources if we have first insisted on explaining everything in them in terms of the primitive community. But, as often, those who appear in one instance as sceptics speak in another the language of warm faith. Bultmann has declared his adhesion to the Barthian theology, and his *Jesus* might well be read for the light it throws on that movement. For him, the actual words which Jesus spoke in Galilee are but very partially known to us, if at all, but the Word of God that came to us in Him, His proclamation of the hour of crisis, and His summons to decision—these are eternal. So Dibelius, when he comes to consider how the Christian world-movement is to be accounted for, finds at the beginning, no longer the community, but a living Man and His disciples, "not a Rabbi, with whom they discuss, not a Leader, whom they follow to a goal, not a Prophet, in whom they believe, but a 'Holy One', whom they surround in wondering reverence, partners of His mission, but strangers to His fate, associated with Him as companions, yet not admitted to the intimacy of His solitude—they for Him the nearest fragment of the world, He for them the first hint of eternity". (*Evangelium und Welt*, 76, f).

E. L. Allen.

TYROLESE SUMMER.

Samuel Butler once advised young writers to keep a note-book. But he added wisely that it should be kept in the pocket. I have had one in a ruc-sac for the last ten days, weighing very lightly on my back. The great weight has been shoes, shirts, mackintosh, shaving apparatus, road-side food, the Oxford collection of detective stories, and the various impedimenta of a walking holiday. The note-book is lamentably empty. I cannot imagine that Samuel Butler himself would have filled one in a Tyrolese valley. His eyes and heart would have been on the hills, and his mind and body too tired at night to record the glory of the day. This valley with its long stretches of the Austrian Alps is more for the heart to keep than for the note-book, and, at any rate, I am sure it wants the swift, straightway eye of St. Mark to capture its light and depth. St. Mark, I suppose, never saw snow in high summer, although he may have laboured with a ruc-sac, drunk greedily from every running stream, and opened his note-book when he was very tired. Baedeker, another note-taker and an immense monument to German efficiency, never tires. He is always swift and sure, and he has led us to this village of Obergurgl, the highest in Austria. It is at the head of the long Oetztal, forty miles from the railway station. You can go no further. Your next step is on ice and snow.

We came up the bridle path this morning from Solden, where a delightful Austrian guest-house kept us for five days. Austria welcomes her visitors as it were into the family. Your room is small and clean, and the maids cheerful and laughing. The proprietor runs about in shorts and the small jacket and feather cocked hat of the Tyrol, and his house is full mainly of Germans from Munich, Dresden, and Berlin, who have come to walk strenuously and continually. Everyone walks. Ten thousand feet up, where the rough boulders give way to long lanes of snow, grandfather and grandmother head the family string bravely making the summit. They all look magnificently fit, and the men are imaginatively dressed in coloured jackets and breeches or embroidered shorts. We seem very pale and dull. But we, too, press on to the hut where the Austrian Alpine Club provides delicious soup with a suet dumpling, hot coffee, and iced drink of citron. From the various huts the more difficult climbs, with guides only, begin. Across the snow, dazzling in the sun, there are two or three strings of people set black against the whiteness, making for the higher hut where they will spend the night on mattresses in a thick atmosphere of soup, smoke, and roaring talk. At five the tramp begins again, into the sun and down into the next valley. It is an endless, energetic holiday.

I am writing this on a verandah spread straight into the eye of the Gurgl Glacier. The evening wind blowing from it is very cold, and the visitors in this village of six houses and no street are wearing their green German cloaks. The night is coming quickly, and the cool air is a great relief after the hot sun on the way up. I kept my eye fast on the green slopes to note the slow unhurried life of the Tyrolese peasant. He is in the depth of Middle Europe, and in its deepest valleys. How he lives is a perpetual mystery—a little hay, plucked desperately from the steep slopes, a few fowls and cows, one or two mules and a huge ramshackle house, half barn, make his establishment. He gives you *"Grüss Gott"* blithely, and smiles at your reply to that heavenly greeting. No cares. I suppose there must be some, especially when the snow comes down the valleys, and winter shuts him up in his fastness—alone and unassailable save for a few winter sports enthusiasts who are beginning to penetrate these

valleys, much to the joy of the hotel-keepers. But he carries his heart lightly, and his children shout greetings across the valley as they struggle with hay-forks too big for them and stumble in boots up to their knees.

It was in these valleys that the old monarchy under Francis Joseph found its most loyal supporters. In one hut I found an engraving of the old Emperor set in evergreen, sharing the place of honour with a shrine of the Virgin. And yet there is new life. The old *krone* has been abolished and the *schilling* is worth 7½d. under the financial stabilization of the League of Nations, which was carried out by a Dutch Protestant financier in conjunction with a Catholic Prime Minister. That strange fellowship itself was a sign of the new place of Austria among the nations. She is small, surrounded by powerful neighbours, but has confidence in herself, and welcomes visitors to see the new life she is making in her valleys and cities.

As I write the church bell is tolling for compline, and the two Fathers are coming across the grass to the simple, stone church. Six cows, with their bells tinkling, are ambling home to be milked. A girl is pushing a baby in a perambulator, and below the verandah two tiny children are beating an old tin. They are fair, with blue eyes, and get pats on the head from the Fathers. Down the steep path from the glacier come a string of climbers, with ice-axes and ropes, while in the front of his hotel mein host warms himself in the last rays of the sun to greet them. We wait eagerly for half-past seven and the evening meal, when there will be much bowing and much laughter. Afterwards we shall walk in the high blackness to see three lights twinkle in the far valley, where the great Brunnenkogel rears its ten thousand feet to guard the gate. And by half-past nine we shall be all in bed.

I have a feeling that Obergurgl would have been saluted by the late Mr. C. E. Montague as a " right place ".

CECIL NORTHCOTT.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London, and the date* 1931 *unless otherwise stated.*)

These Hundred Years: 1831-1931. By ALBERT PEEL, M.A., Litt.D. Congregational Union of England and Wales. 7s. 6d.

By this centenary History of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, Dr. Peel has added to his well-deserved laurels, and has placed his fellow-Congregationalists, and indeed all who are deeply concerned with modern developments in the Christian Church, under a lasting obligation. We have before us a full account of the Union's life and activity from those early days when zealous Independents looked with profound suspicion upon any and every attempt to introduce a third magnitude between the local church and the Church Universal, to these days of Central Funds and Moderators and all the immense activities that centre in the Memorial Hall. "All the great personalities", the jacket informs us, "who have taken part in the life and work of organized Congregationalism during the last hundred years appear in these pages, which contain vivid accounts of critical episodes of the Union's history". Those who know Dr. Peel will not need to be told that the work is based upon original sources, many of which have not hitherto been made accessible, while others have long been buried in the pages of forgotten periodicals.

The staunch Independent of to-day need not bristle up because this book is described as an "official" history of the Union. Dr. Peel has discharged a difficult task in that spirit of objectivity which characterizes the judicious historian. He is himself an Independent *sans phrase*, and yet a profound believer in the Union as based on the principles of the Savoy Declaration of 1658, which assumes that Independent Churches will seek fellowship with one another, and take counsel for common ends.

Denominational History, except so far as concerns the heroic age, can be, and often is, abominably dry. But Dr. Peel has a touch of genius. He sets before us a great story, and it is greatly told. It has all the thrill of a novel, and most readers will find it difficult to lay it down once they have taken it up. The author sets out his chapters as episodes in a romantic story of the sea. The Union is a ship that sets sail on many an adventurous quest. It often meets foul weather, sometimes it well-nigh founders, but the courage and skill of its captains and pilots bring it safe home to port again. For ourselves there was something of the appeal of a detective story in it. For there is a problem running through from start to finish, *viz.*, the discovery of the proper balance between Independency and organization in a union of Churches which shall remain a union of Churches on Catholic lines instead of becoming that United Congregational Church of Parker's dream, whose very name (*pace Jovis tonantis*), suggests sectarianism of the straitest sort. To be sure the problem is not by any means solved when we reach the end of the volume, but the reader does at least feel that most of the clues are in his hands, and that he can contemplate the probable outcome with some degree of equanimity.

It is good to come to close quarters with men like the Wilsons, father and son, David Bogue, Henry Rogers, Joseph Fletcher, John Angell

James, and other fathers of the Union, and later on with Lynch of the *Rivulet,* and that stormy soul, John Campbell, as well as to revive older memories of Hannay, Dale, and Guinness Rogers, and younger memories of Fairbairn, Forsyth, and Silvester Horne.

Many, however, will find the chief interest of the book in the light that it throws upon the problems of contemporary Congregationalism. It is part of the function of history to clarify the mind and deliver us from hasty views. Many of the questions that come up before the Council of the Union to-day, ostensibly as brand-new issues, are shown by Dr. Peel to be almost as old as the Union itself, and the present generation is more likely to deal with them wisely if it begins to understand why the problems have arisen at all. And on the other hand those impatient spirits who are ready to make all sorts of surrenders in the supposed interests of Christian charity might do well to learn from the debates and resolutions of the Assembly in past years why our fathers took the stand they did and what they tried to save us from. Two chapters of this volume deal, *e.g.,* with the question of education. How many of us are aware that in the forties a Congregational Board of Education was set up in order to establish and maintain Congregational Day Schools on an unsectarian basis and without State aid, and that large sums of money were raised year by year for this object, and that for many years Congregationalists, at their own expense, ran their own Teacher Training College? It is popularly supposed that all this was left to the Anglicans, who thereby acquired a vested interest in education. The fact that Congregational Schools were subsequently surrendered in the interests of a national system ought to count on the side of their demand for popular, and unsectarian, control.

One is impressed by the continued zeal of the Union through the greater part of these years for Home Evangelization, including Church Extension and Chapel-building. Without the constant stimulus of the Union in these directions, Congregationalists would be but feeble folk to-day. It is an inspiring story that Dr. Peel has to tell under this head.

Another thing that will surprise many is the boldness of the Assembly in dealing with public questions in the seventies and eighties of last century. Again and again we find it taking a strong line on disarmament and arbitration, and manifesting so deep a sympathy with the aspirations of labour that it is difficult to understand the charge so commonly made that the working classes abandoned "organized" Christianity because it failed to support them in their legitimate demands. Whatever the temper of the individual churches may have been, the Union at least gave a higher lead.

We have before us then a story of union which becomes ever more effective as the century draws near its close. And yet it is not a story of dull uniformity. The Congregational Union has not by any means standardized either its churches or their people. Theological and other divergencies have been abundantly manifested; sometimes indeed they have threatened to split the Union. But the spirit of fellowship has prevailed, and the story of "these hundred years" has abundantly proved that uniformity is not among the essentials of Christian unity and co-operation.

E. J. Price.

The Life and Letters of Sir Edmund Gosse. By the Hon. Evan Charteris. Heinemann. 25s.

In some ways we are sorry we have read this book, informing as are many of the pages, dealing, as they do, with some of the outstanding

literary figures during Gosse's long life. Gosse we knew merely as literary critic and as author of that remarkable and revealing book *Father and Son,* "the record of a struggle between two temperaments, two consciences, and almost two epochs", a book which we greatly admired. But we had felt that Gosse the critic always took good care to be on the safe side, and could always be relied upon to praise the well-established, and to look with superiority on the tyro; in short, knowing nothing of the man apart from his writings, and respecting him for the range of his knowledge of books, we had come to share the opinion, which Mr. Charteris says was unjustly held,

> that in the case of a "modern", however much he might have held back, yet he would be on the platform when the day of public recognition came—that he would only come on board when the sails were up and the vessel under weigh.

Mr. Charteris attempts to counter this verdict, but we have to confess that Gosse, as revealed in this book, is far from an attractive figure. As a young man, in his enthusiasm for Tennyson, in his love-making, in his Smilesian determination to get on, he "dates". He works hard and conscientiously, but

> He had set himself to know everyone of note;—he was insatiably anxious to be in the thick of things literary, to be recognized and applauded, and rank high among writers.

As he succeeds there seems to be an element of posing: he is so anxious to know the right people, so careful to say the right thing, so sensitive about his reputation, and so frightfully proper. Sometimes, too, he is disingenuous. He is not, of course, to be blamed for holding that Russia, which, in April, 1917, "seems all right", by August "seems as rotten as nuts", but his references to Andrew Lang give one to pause. Having written to a Frenchman, on Lang's death, referring to him as "the most elegant mind that the English-speaking race has brought forth in our time", he should not so easily have agreed with Henry James four months later that Lang's "puerility was heart-rending!" It was, no doubt, things like this which made Mr. Philip Guedalla say that he would be proud if he could believe Gosse meant half of the praise he had proffered, a comment hotly resented by Gosse, who said: "I always mean exactly the whole of what I write".

Gosse moved in a narrow and restricted sphere in his youth. He lacked a Public School and University education, and he had no contact with "Society". It was, without doubt, his undue consciousness of shortcomings in these respects which made him so touchy, so marked by *amour-propre,* so delighted with his association with titled people when he became Librarian of the House of Lords.

Despite all that he did, his amazing industry, and his wide acquaintance with men and books, we close this volume liking the young Gosse, a narrow-minded, conscientious Sunday-School teacher, better than Sir Edmund Gosse, C.B., who calls great men by their Christian names.

When this has been said, we can admit that there has been pleasure in reading these pages. There are good stories, some of which we have related elsewhere; and there are interesting verdicts on literary and political figures. Thus, in 1916:

> Never was there, in all our Island story, a Prime Minister who cared a third part as much about letters and the sorrows of scribbling men, as Asquith did. Apollo bless him for it. Our new Dictator is without one scrap of the humanities.

Swinburne, R.L.S., Hardy, as well as many literary men still living, all help to give colour and interest to a long book.

EDITOR.

Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings. By C. G. MONTEFIORE, D.Litt., D.D. Macmillan. 15s.

The bulk of this book deals with the sayings or reputed sayings of Jesus as recorded in *Matthew*. A few pages at the end treat of passages peculiar to *Luke*. The work is in some sort a sequel to the author's *The Synoptic Gospels*. Dr. Montefiore seeks to examine with scrupulous fairness the question of how far the teaching of Jesus was original in the sense that it differed from that of the Rabbis. In some respects this book may be regarded as an addendum to, and sometimes a gentle corrective of, Strack-Billerbeck's monumental commentary, to which constant and very appreciative reference is made throughout. The author has indented continually on the assistance of Mr. H. Loewe, the Oxford Reader in Rabbinics, whose sympathetic Jewish piety invests his contributions with as much importance as does his encyclopædic knowledge of Mishnah and Talmud. The results of such an essentially detailed study naturally cannot be summed in a sentence. In many cases Dr. Montefiore (Mr. Loewe does not always agree) does find that Jesus broke away from the normal position of Jewish teaching, notably in His treatment of the relations of men and women, "a new departure of enormous significance and importance". The eating with tax-collectors and sinners is also "a new and gracious characteristic of Jesus", though Mr. Loewe adds, "you will note that neither here nor in *Mark* and *Luke* is Jesus blamed after he had given his explanation".

Dr. Montefiore pays great attention to Prof. Moore's *Judaism* and the late Dr. Abrahams's *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*. Plainly a great deal of water has flowed under the bridges since the present writer began his studies of this subject with Trench's *Parables* and Wendt's *Lehre Jesu*. Dr. Montefiore does not ignore the problems raised from the radical point of view by such critics as Drews or Loisy. He allows for the possibility of accretion to the original sayings of Jesus in the way of comments and would-be elucidatory additions. His position is that the sayings in their present form give us the first century idea of Jesus' mind, and thus may be fairly compared with the *corpus* of Rabbinic teaching. To the work of the Oxford School on Synoptic analysis, culminating in Canon Streeter's *Four Gospels*, our author pays due deference, and its main positions are assumed. But in view of the researches recently published by Prof. M. Dibelius and Dr. K. L. Schmidt, it does seem that we should make more allowance than is here done for the motives which led to the preservation of certain sayings and narratives as ammunition for the preachers of evangelical salvation. And if this be the case—if the *formgeschichtliche Schule* is right—then we may have to revise Dr. Montefiore's categorical denial that any of the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptics are capable of interpretation in a Pauline-Lutheran soteriological sense. Jesus may not have meant this; but perhaps His words as handed down by the *Urchristentum* believers may have been made to mean it. In any case the indispensability both of a knowledge of German, and of Hebrew-Aramaic studies, for due appreciation of this subject, is patent. Certainly it is very difficult, after reading this book, to maintain the absolute antithesis formerly drawn between the new and Christian and the old and Jewish, at any rate as far as the sayings of Jesus are concerned.

J. P. NAISH.

The Bronze Age. By V. G. Childe, B.Litt. Cambridge Press. 8s. 6d.

Prof. Childe has written an excellent handbook which fills a real gap. The period between the neolithic peoples and the Hallstatt and derived La Tène cultures which overlapped the coming of the Roman civilization is a difficult one. Such investigators as Montelius, Reinecke, and Déchelette have each his own system of chronological division. Moreover, most of the evidence hitherto published is scattered in a great number of specialist magazines written in half-a-score of the literary languages of Europe. An attempt to correlate this mass of detail for the layman was overdue. The author holds to the old maxim *Ex oriente lux*. Culture swept in successive waves from Egypt and from Mesopotamia to the N.W., over the Ægean countries. He would distinguish between two different (Anatolian and Egyptian) culture-types of bronzes and pottery. The Early Bronze Period he dates in Europe proper from 1800-1500 B.C., the Late Period from 1300 B.C., these figures being "only valid for the standard region along the central amber trade route".

It is interesting to notice that the insistence of the old classical school on the preponderant importance in history of the Helladic civilization is being borne out. That civilization rested, of course, on far older Ægean and Egyptian cultures. And the S.E. corner of Europe was highly civilized when the ancestors of our peasantry were still neolithic. "A single tomb on the Acropolis of Mycenae contained more gold than has been collected from thousands of British barrows". The caution regarding the use of language as a criterion of race is well taken. The general use of gramophone and motor-car in Africa and the Orient to-day might warn us to be careful how we deduce the racial character of a people from the tools or words which it employed!

J. P. Naish.

The Psalms. By H. H. Gowen, D.D. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

The Psalms. By A. S. Way, D.Lit. Epworth Press. 6s.

The O.T. Wisdom Books. By H. Ranston, M.A., Litt.D. Epworth Press. 10s.

Of these two translations of the post-Exilic Jewish hymn book into modern English verse, Dr. Gowen's seems to us the more valuable, inasmuch as it has been made from a Hebrew text carefully reconstructed by his own competent scholarship, whereas Dr. Way offers no evidence that he has used the Hebrew originals at all, and seems to depend on *R.V.* and the Jewish official English translation. He gives no notes to indicate what readings he favours, whilst Prof. Gowen does so, and thus enables us to see clearly and quickly what Hebrew words he is translating. To those to whom beautiful English is of more importance than an exact rendering of the original thought Dr. Way's method will appeal more than to those who, in spite of the frequent ambiguities and baffling obscurities of the Hebrew text, still believe that it is worth while to find out (where we can) exactly what the Jewish hymn writers did think about God, man, and religious experience. It is true, of course, that all those who have attempted to teach the Hebrew Psalter know how untranslatable the present text is in places. In such, emendation, whilst inevitable, is also inevitably conjectural.

Some years ago we noticed with pleasure Dr. Ranston's previous book *Ecclesiastes and the Greek Wisdom Literature*. In the present work he has given us a solid, useful, and up-to-date commentary on the canonical Wisdom books, including the *Song*. He makes full use of the best modern

scholarship, whilst not disdaining, I am glad to note, the thorough work of a past generation, *e.g.*, that of Cheyne and W. T. Davison. It is doubtless his residence in New Zealand which has as yet given him no opportunity of seeing Prof. Paul Humbert's *Sources égypt. de la Litt. Sap. d'Israël.* He would have found abundant encouragement in the Lausanne professor's work for his courageous acceptance of the theory that Egyptian originals lie behind much of the Hebrew wisdom-literature. It is impossible that every Hebraist should be also an Egyptologist, but those, like Alt and Humbert, who are so, are in a position to realize the close connexion of Egyptian with the derived Hebrew civilization. The same applies, naturally, to Babylonian.

J. P. NAISH.

Politics and Society in the O.T. By S. C. CARPENTER, B.D. Williams & Norgate. 7s. 6d.

Digging up the Past. By C. L. WOOLLEY. Benn. 6s.

Ur of the Chaldees. By C. L. WOOLLEY. Benn. 7s. 6d.

The Accuracy of the O.T. By J. GARROW DUNCAN, B.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Digging up Biblical History. By J. GARROW DUNCAN, B.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The first two of these books were originally written as broadcast talks. None the less, they are both excellent from beginning to end. It is a pleasure to find that the B.B.C. allows such latitude in expounding the *O.T.*, even to a King's chaplain! And Mr. Carpenter's sound and capable treatment is worthy of the freedom accorded. The book has received favourable notices everywhere and deserves them, even although not much in it should be new to clerical readers of this journal. Mr. Woolley's little volume on excavating is brilliant. Concise and to the point, it tells exactly what field archæologists are doing, and explains with admirable lucidity both the methods used and the real relevance of the results. *Qua* digger he is a master craftsman, and he is also a master of terse and vigorous English (*o rara avis* !). His *Ur of the Chaldees* seems to us a great advance on *The Sumerians.* It is a monograph on the particular site with which his name is most closely associated in our minds, and to which his ripest work has been devoted for years. He speaks here of that which he knows as no other could, and the book is at once of importance and of fascinating interest.

Mr. Garrow Duncan's smaller work, like Mr. Woolley's well supplied with photographs, is an attempt to illustrate Biblical passages by comparing them with specific archæological discoveries, which latter are to our mind more interesting in themselves than as apologetic ammunition. Mr. Duncan does hold, we believe, that the patriarchs were real persons whose real adventures have been recorded in detail. We are unable to see how such a view is of assistance to religious faith. The connexion escapes us. However, Mr. Duncan is a very distinguished digger, and, like many archæologists, is stronger possibly on the archæological than on the documentary side. His larger volume is a very full and admirable compendium of information, with many excellent drawings and illustrations of the numerous diggings which have been conducted in Palestine from the time of Bliss and Petrie's beginnings in the 80's until the present day. The recent work at Shechem and Mizpah is included. This book is much more complete and less popular than his colleague's, Prof. Macalister's, well known *Century of Excavation in Palestine,* not so easy to read, but of much more use as a store-house of facts, and may, perhaps, supply to some extent the lack in English of a book comparable to Père Vincent's *Canaan*

d'après l'Explor. réc., since Dr. Handcock's book is unfortunately now somewhat out-of-date. This does not mean that we subscribe unreservedly to all Mr. Duncan's theories regarding the T.A. tablets and the Boghaz-Keui evidence. *That* is another story.

J. P. Naish.

The Origins of the Festival of Hanukkah. By O. S. Rankin, B.D., Litt.D. Clark. 12s.

Those who enjoyed the friendship of the late Hugo Gressmann will recognize his methods of approach behind his pupil's work. It is a far cry from Hermann's *Orphica* (1805) to the present position of our knowledge of Greek, and in particular, of Hellenic, religion. Farnell's *Cults* and Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena* marked a real epoch in this development, and the work of Nilsson and Rohde (unhappily carefully misspelt Rhode throughout this book) has carried the subject still farther. It is now evident that we cannot hope to understand the extraordinary *mélange* of religious thought and cultus that encompassed the Judaism from which Christianity emerged, without comparing Babylonian and Iranian evidence with the accumulating mass of material from Greek sources, which now includes numbers of papyri and inscriptions and reliefs and paintings, throwing daily fresh light on the references embedded in the surviving literature. Dr. Rankin has tried to bring all this formidable battery to bear on the scanty evidence from *Maccabees*, the *Fourth Gospel*, and Rabbinic sources, regarding the Jewish festival of lamps, called *hanukkah* or *encænia*. There are certain obvious names which we miss in his list of authorities. In particular Baudissin's *Adonis u. Esmun* is lacking, as also Eissfeldt's continued studies on the same subject, and Wilcken's work on the papyri. But perhaps the author felt that these would take him too far afield.

The main thesis, that the Hanukkah festival is a syncretic observance derived from old heathen sources, and that the attempts of 2 *Macc.* to find its origin in the re-dedication of the Temple in 165, and of Grätz to make the lamps symbolic of the law, are not historically justifiable, seems established. The evidence from Valerius Maximus for the existence of the festival amongst Roman Jews in 139 B.C., and that of Hecatæus for Jewish assimilation of many pagan usages as early as 290 B.C., are both pertinent. That apocalyptic developments were connected with the two equations Kronos = Helios = Hypsistos and Zarvan = Bel = Kronos, is indubitable. And the whole modern movement of Biblical research is rightly in the direction of studying the *N.T.* in connexion with the later parts of the *O.T.* and with Rabbinic and apocalyptic thought, and relating these in turn with Hellenist syncretism and Hellenic cults and beliefs. At the same time the importance of the Maccabean crisis should be and is duly stressed. Bousset's emphasis is certainly correct here. For the rest, Hatch told us long ago that the myth is always later than the rite to which it is attached. Of Biblical and post-Biblical Judaism this is especially true, since official Yahwism in organizing and regularizing the old pre-exilic festivals, deliberately attached to each a historical event and a literary docket. And this process was continued in the cases of feasts added later under Persian or Hellenist influence, like Purim and Hanukkah.

J. P. Naish.

The Riddle of the New Testament. By Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, Bart., and Noel Davey. Faber & Faber. 10s. 6d.

The Head of the Corner. By Louis Matthews Sweet. Scribners. 7s. 6d.

Jewish Views of Jesus. By Thomas Walker, D.D. Allen & Unwin. 4s. 6d.

I am of Apollos. By A. J. WALKER. Williams & Norgate. 6s.

A New Harmony of the Gospels. By R. H. CROMPTON. Author-Partner Press. 3s. 6d.

Chalcedon. By J. S. MACARTHUR. S.P.C.K. 6s.

In spite of its sustained tendency to repetition, the first named book is one of the freshest *N.T.* studies that has appeared for some time, and the repetition or reiteration serves a useful purpose in clinching the successive stages of an argument that advances steadily to its conclusion. That conclusion is that Primitive Christianity derived its inspiration from no other source than its nominal founder, and that Jesus was infinitely more than a humanitarian teacher of moral philosophy. God was in Christ, striking into human history in a unique way. Synoptic writers, Paul, the Fourth Gospel, are all at one in this :

> The New Testament contains everywhere a concrete and exclusive claim to provide the revelation which solves the deepest problems of human life; it contains also everywhere a concrete and exclusive claim that a decision concerning this revelation is urgent.

As an outline of critical methods of *N.T.* study and of the results thereby reached, this scholarly yet unpedantic volume will be of high value to others than the laymen for whom it is primarily intended.

The next book on the list has points of contact with the first in its subject. Dr. Sweet holds the chair of Systematic Theology at the Chicago Presbyterian Seminary, and in a very readable little volume presents the fruits of his enquiries into the question of how the personality of Jesus became a great part of the religion which He founded. His title sums up the process by which Jesus has been built into the structure of the Christian faith. "The person of Jesus, *known in experience,* is the basis of the whole Christian edifice".

Dr. Walker, who is already known as a successful worker in the field of the relation of the teaching of Jesus to that of the Jewish teaching of His age, has conferred a signal boon on busy people by the present volume in which he gives us the marrow of half-a-dozen significant and representative recent books by Jewish writers on Jesus. Two of these (Goodwin and Friedländer) reflect "orthodox" and two (Montefiore and Abrahams "liberal" Judaism, while Jacobs and Klausner present what may be called "portraits" of Jesus. The *précis* has been most competently and sympathetically carried out, and the author rounds off his task by an introduction on the earlier and later forms of Jewish tradition on Jesus, and a conclusion in which he offers some reflexions on the whole subject. Altogether a serviceable bit of work for both Jews and Christians.

The sub-title of Mr. A. J. Walker's book is "Light on the Synoptic Problem from a School of John the Baptist". Like Canon Raven, who sponsors the study, we felt a little sceptical at first, and perhaps not quite satisfied at last, yet gladly admitting that the author has knowledge as well as zeal and is a diligent and painstaking investigator. He would place Apollos between the Baptist and Paul in his apprehension of truth as it is in Jesus. Apollos had not to unlearn anything that he had gathered from the disciples of John, but he had a good deal more to learn. For the teaching of the Baptist School Mr. Walker postulates a Q which he thinks is discernible in varied form and extent in *Mark, Luke,* and *Matthew.* No one can read the book carefully without a real accession of insight into the Apostolic Age and the growth of the Gospel narrative.

Mr. Crompton finds *Luke* capable of division into two parts, a symbolical (composed of stories) and a didactic (composed of sayings). Each

part has eight series and each series seven stages, designed "to progressively reveal to the catechumen the special teaching of the series". This re-arrangement is Mr. Crompton's proto-*Luke*, a Gospel where the events and sayings serve a didactic purpose. One can always learn a good deal from a Synopticon even when not based on the earliest Gospel or on chronological rather than didactic criteria, and the author has, in addition to re-arranging *Luke*, furnished parallels from *Matthew* and *Mark* and occasionally from *John*. I fancy that Luke himself would admire the ingenuity and toil that have gone to this suggestive reconstruction, but would say "We never saw it on this fashion". Two misprints should be corrected; on p. vi "Comforter" has become "Counterfort", and on p. 3 "prophesy" should be "prophecy".

Mr. MacArthur's study of Chalcedon is a thoughtful and well-documented piece of work which will be useful to all students of fourth century Christology. By successive stages he leads us past Antioch, Ephesus, Nestorius, Cyril, Eutyches and Leo to the famous *Definition* itself, naturally keeping his regard mainly on doctrinal questions, though not unmindful of the personal issues involved in the bitter rivalry between Alexandria and Constantinople. In the concluding chapters, "The Definition Criticized" and "The Definition Interpreted", he shows himself familiar with all the best recent work on the Person of Christ and finds himself most in agreement with the position of Canon Quick.

A. J. Grieve.

St. Paul's Voyage to Rome: a critical inquiry. By Llynfi Davies. Headley 6s.

Mr. Davies is already known as the author of an intriguing little book on "Pauline Re-adjustments", reviewed in *Congregational Quarterly*, January, 1928, p. 109. In Part I of the present work (the title of which is an absolute and unhappy misnomer) he returns to the task of finding room for a visit of Paul to Crete at the end of the second missionary tour, and makes out a plausible case that in *Acts* 27 we should retain verses 1, 1b, 6, 9ff, and transfer verses 2, 3a, 4, 5, 7, 8 to *Acts* 18^{21} (after "if God will"). It is well known that the narrative and text of the end of *Acts* 18 present peculiar difficulties, and it would be unfair to the author to set out his complete solution of these in this place, though it may be said that in his anxiety to prove his case to the hilt he seems to make some unnecessary transpositions. Nor are we convinced by his argument for the date of *Galatians*.

Part II is taken up with the question of Apollos, a personage in Early Christian history whose significance is engaging, and is destined to engage, considerable attention from students of the subject. Our author believes that Paul met him first in Crete (*Titus* 3^{13}) and sent for him to come to Ephesus but missed him, that Apollos after his sojourn with Prisca and Aquila (*Acts* 18^{27ff}) accepted the invitation of some interested Corinthians (*Codex Bezae*) to visit their city, and there caused trouble by the Alexandrian element in his preaching. This trouble Paul sought to compose by the writing known to us as the *Epistle to the Hebrews* ("a *safe* Philonian view of Christ"), which he vainly wished Apollos (now again in Ephesus) to take across to Corinth (1 *Cor.* 16^{12}). This suggestion as to the authorship of *Hebrews* turns largely on the meaning of the verb μετασχηματίζω 1 *Cor.* 4^{6}, and we believe that Mr. Davies has at least made out his case against the current English rendering. His observations on ἐπιβαίνω *Acts* 27^{2} and κατηχέω in Acts 18^{25} also seem to us pertinent and sound.

A. J. Grieve.

The Record of the Loved Disciple, together with the Gospel of St. Philip, being a Reconstruction of the Sources of the Fourth Gospel. By E. S. HOERNLE. Blackwell. 8s. 6d.

One more theory of the authorship and the composition of the Fourth Gospel! Considering the importance of the solution for Christian scholarship, and the difficulty of the problem, we must not complain of any fresh attempt. Although I cannot commit myself to the acceptance of his theory, I am in agreement with the author on the main issue. We cannot regard the Fourth Gospel as either mainly history (the traditional view), or as merely doctrine (the critical view); but must recognize its composite and even inconsistent character. Not only does its difference from the Synoptic Gospels in content and form make it impossible for us to place it alongside of the Synoptics as in the same sense a historical source for the life of Jesus; but the displacements which scholarship has been increasingly recognizing, and the contradictions of purpose and standpoint within itself which a close scrutiny discloses, make it quite impossible to accept the poetic description of its unity as a seamless robe. On this starting-point of his investigation I am entirely in agreement with the author. His critical analysis, however, entirely differs from that which I offered in *The Beloved Disciple*: I cannot summarize here the account of the various sources he discovers, or his description of the complex process of compilation.

The author in developing his theory freely assumes that in the original MS. with which the compiler had to deal, loose leaves had been misplaced, lost, or partly torn. In that case he does not hesitate about supplying what seems to him lacking. In his Appendixes, he seeks to show that the detached passages would just fill up a page in the MS., that these pages are poetical stanzas of an irregular rhythm, that the Greek text needs emendation in some places, and that explanatory notes were inserted by the compilers.

To offer a critical estimate of this latest theory in its details would involve a very long, and, to most readers, probably wearisome article. I can give only a general impression. Mr. Hoernle's procedure must often seem arbitrary, as he does not give that minute analysis on which a theory of the sources must be based. Despite all the arguments advanced in justification of his handling of the sources—such as the difficulty of dealing with an ancient MS., and the recognized methods of ancient editors copyists, *etc.*—the author has not convinced me that his procedure has been strictly objective.

Personally, I should not so completely exclude records of miracles from the Report of the Loved Disciple as Mr. Hoernle does, while ascribing the heightening of the supernatural, where that is present, to later editorial influence. On the other hand, I cannot so completely accept the Report of the Loved Disciple as reproducing the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, but must allow far more for the modification of reminiscence by reflexion, and the addition of reflexion to reminiscence. While agreeing that it is not psychologically credible that a writer who records Jesus' sayings about truth should have himself been guilty of free invention of history on the scale many critics assign to the author of the Fourth Gospel (p. 114), yet language such as the following seems reckless:

> For the view, not infrequently expressed, that John put into the mouth of Jesus not Jesus' words but his "own doctrine about Jesus" there is not the shadow of warrant (p. 156); [all] the individual sayings are genuine [and] St. John was responsible for their arrangement only (p. 157).

We cannot isolate any sections of the Gospel entirely from the effects of the lapse of time, or the influence of the environment in Ephesus. Thus, while in sympathy with the author's main purpose to vindicate the historical value of the Fourth Gospel to a higher degree than modern critics generally allow, I cannot accept his solution of the problem as adequate and satisfying; but I welcome his book as an interesting and suggestive contribution to a theme of unfailing attraction to every Christian scholar.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

The Meaning of the Revelation. By PHILIP CARRINGTON, M.A. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

This volume of 424 pages, which the writer with undue modesty describes as a small work, is not an Introduction to the *Revelation,* for the questions which fall under that heading are only casually referred to, nor is it a word-to-word commentary such as is usual; it is rather a running commentary on the content of the book, "elucidating its meaning". The author justifies his omission of matters of Introduction as follows:

> I have neglected the question of authorship, and concentrated on the meaning. I have referred to the author as John, and very occasionally I have spoken of him as if he were the Apostle. I have casually noted a number of cross-references to the fourth gospel; but they are only such as occurred to me naturally as I went along; I made no search for them. The identity of the author makes no difference to the soundness of my interpretation.

The author's attitude, however, is not quite so neutral, as he assumes that the writer whose book he is interpreting was in the same situation as the Apostle John probably was. Rejecting very decisively the *Future-Historical* method, which interprets the book as a record of human history as a whole, and as predicting events still in the future, and dealing very effectively as occasion offers with the absurdities of Second Adventism, he combines the *Spiritual* interpretation, which finds in it "symbols of general principles which may be seen at work in any age", with the *Present-Historical,* which represents great principles as "working themselves out in actual history" past or contemporary. He refuses to recognize a mythological basis for the symbols; he denies the dependence of the author on the non-canonical apocalypses; he seeks to demonstrate the close dependence on *O.T.* prophecy (especially *Ezekiel, Daniel* and *Zechariah* 12-15) and on the eschatological teaching of the *N.T.;* in interpreting the symbols he avoids the allegorizing method, which tries to find a double meaning in each detail. He is an enthusiast for the literary beauty and the spiritual significance of the book, and indulges occasionally in a tone of contempt and words of ridicule for scholars who handle the subject differently which one would prefer to find absent from a work of high merit, as this is. As giving a spiritual interpretation of current history he shows how the book treats past events and events about to happen as future, after the manner of apocalypse. Writing in the reign of Domitian at the end of the first century (A.D. 95) the writer places himself in the decade 60-70; but some of his visions may go back to an earlier date.

An outline of the Contents will also show the course of the exposition. In Book I the author indicates the material, *Pre-Christian and Christian,* which the writer had at his disposal. Book II is concerned with the *Introductory Vision* and the *Letters to the Seven Churches.* Book III deals with *This Age* in two parts, one an outline of the history of the past

(cc. 4-7), and another "the inner history of humanity corresponding to the outward course of empire" (8-9). Chapter 10 is described as a *Parenthesis*. Here the prophet's call is recorded, his theme being the building of the spiritual temple and the witness against the earthly Jerusalem. Book V is described as *The Interlude*. To the Christ of Part I is opposed Anti-Christ of Part II (cc. $12\text{-}14^3$). Books VI and VII deal with *The Age to Come*. The Doom of Babylon (14^4—19^{10}) is contrasted with the Triumph of Christ and His Church (19^{11}—21^8). Book VIII discusses the Epilogue (21^9—22^{21}) and the Reception and Influence of the Book. One appendix deals with the Levitical Symbolism of Revelation, another with Primitive Hebrew Gnosticism. Very skilful use is made in the exposition of the subjects dealt with more fully in these appendixes.

Some interesting points in the exposition may be noted. Chapter 10 is regarded as the watershed between the past and the future, and as recording the writer's call to become a prophet soon after the death of James, his brother, on the assumption that he is John, the son of Zebedee. Very full evidence is offered for the interpretation of the Woman in chapter 12 as not only the ideal Israel, but as Mary, the mother of Jesus. A skilful argument is offered for the identification of Michael with Christ Himself. The Roman Empire is symbolized in the Beast, and the number of the Beast is equated with *Neron Kaisar*. But, contrary to the general view, the writer strenuously insists on identifying Babylon, not with Rome, but with Jerusalem: for this he adduces parallels from the eschatological teaching of Jesus as well as from Josephus. He points out that the figure of the Church as the Bride of Christ is not stressed, inasmuch as the Woman has been represented as the Mother: but that the writer passes from the symbol of the Bride to that of the City, the heavenly in contrast to the earthly Jerusalem, on which God's doom had fallen. In the section on the subsequent history of the book, the author seems to me to show some bias against Puritanism as the modern Montanism and in favour of what may be broadly called the Catholic view.

Mr. Carrington certainly gets away from prosaic literalism and a dry-as-dust learning, and expounds with enthusiastic appreciation what he regards as the greatest poem in the world. Whether his exposition will stand the searching scrutiny of other scholars in its details or not, he has written a book which the majority of readers will enjoy more than most of the volumes written upon a book which has been found hard to understand, has been the basis of many exegetical and theological follies and futilities, and has probably not been as highly regarded as in his judgment it ought to be in the Christian Church. ALFRED E. GARVIE.

Studies in the Philosophy of Religion. By Dr. A. SETH PRINGLE-PATTISON. Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.

This, unless I am dreaming, is a book of quite exceptional worth. It contains more ripe wisdom on the real meaning, the abiding and ultimate meaning, of human life—seen in the light of its total environment, the Universe, and as the prime key to the latter's own meaning—than any volume known to me. Though modestly entitled "Studies", its chapters have nothing tentative about them: they are the final, mature estimates of a life-long thinker, in whom the true philosopher and the truly religious man blend in singular and most beautiful harmony. Full of concrete, vivid matter, presented in a lucid and charming style, they are readable from first to last and understandable by almost any thoughtful mind: yet they constitute a real and most comprehensive unity, in virtue of the completely unified nature of that author's own mind, one equally alive to reality

s scientific fact, as human history, and as the ordering faculty of ideal ıought.

His characteristic standpoint, which enables him to handle all the varied ıaterial here brought in review with sympathetic insight and in an essen- ally positive spirit, and which in turn authenticates itself by its fruits, erhaps comes out most clearly in what he says of Lessing's "short tract, *he Education of the Human Race,* published in 1780", which "marks ıe beginning of the Philosophy of Religion, as we understand it to-day".

> Its central idea—the idea of a continuous revelation to the race, proceeding by stages, and comparable to the process of education in the case of the individual man—is so important because it raises us above the abstract opposition between reason and revelation, and the equally untenable contrast between a religion of pure reason and the mere superstition of the popular creeds. By *giving a wider scope to reason and a more inward meaning to revelation,* it enables us to see in the historic faiths of mankind the vehicles of the moral and spiritual education of the race (p. 6).

It is in the spirit of the words here put in italics that our author him- lf proceeds to give a concrete depiction of the course of the Divine ·lucation of Man, in a way that shows him to possess, like Lessing, the ıstorical sense as well as the philosopher's synthetic insight in a very ımarkable degree.

The variety of the topics passed in review in some 250 pages—beginning th primitive religion (in the light of all current anthroplogical know- ·lge), advancing through the religions of Greece and of Israel, and cul- ·nating in the Christianity of Christ and the *N.T.,* with a final chapter on ·he Christ of the Creeds"—might seem so immense as to preclude either ıequacy of appreciation or organic unity of effect. But such is Dr. ingle-Pattison's grasp of the whole material, and his skill in selecting ·y the really significant and typical, that he seems to have succeeded oughout in the task he has essayed, *viz.,* to give a true bird's eye w of the course of the religious development of humanity on the whole— ·t is, as represented by the most progressive and spiritually significant ·ts of it thus far. As regards the part of the field where the present ıiewer has most competence to test his author's findings by first-hand dy, *viz.,* primitive Christianity, the one point at which he seems to ›pt the less probable interpretation is in carrying the realistic view of ıraments back even to Judaism, in the Baptism of John, instead of ıating it as a secondary element in Christianity, first found in non- ·ish circles and not shared by the radically Hebraic mind of St. Paul.

Taken all in all, this book has left on my mind the impression of rare ıpetence and fairness of judgment, high philosophic gift, and deep ·gious experimental insight. If one had to describe its quality in a ·d, it would be as "satisfying" to the reason—in the large, inclusive se of the latter term which underlies the passage quoted above. There o single book which would more repay repeated perusal and pondering, e by ministers and laymen who feel a real need to understand human ıstence, and religion as that which gives to human life, in theory and ·ractice, the key to its spiritualization.

VERNON BARTLET.

and his Religion: An Essay in the comparative study of religions ancient and modern. By S. P. T. PRIDEAUX, D.D. Williams & Norgate. 10s.

This book covers much the same ground as that traversed by Dr. ngle-Pattison. But it does so with a more directly practical and apolo- ıc aim, that of showing the finality of Christianity as *the* religion of

religions. Four chapters of "General Survey" contain a large collectio of religious phenomena, particularly primitive usages of a ritual an sacramental kind, as a background on which are set forth (cc. vi-viii) ce tain principles of religion; in the light of which the argument advanc to consider and justify (cc. ix, x) the inclusive value of the Faith a Mission of the Church, understood in a moderate Anglican way.

The merits of the book are those of a handy compendium of facts an views such as might fitly form the substance of lectures to those preparin for work in the foreign mission-field (which seems to have been its actu origin). But while for this purpose it is instructive and valuable up to point, it is not marked by much grasp or insight; and unless supplement by teaching or reading having these qualities, would leave its reader wit out any really organic view of the field covered, and apt also to rest co tented with a too conventional conception of what in Christianity ca fairly claim finality. The root problem here involved, that touching th adequacy of the conceptual forms in which the creative ideas given the personality and teaching of Christ Himself have thus far found expre sion, has not been faced, much less answered.

VERNON BARTLET.

The Historic Jesus. By Professor JAMES MACKINNON. Longmans. 16s.

The attempts to write a life of Jesus have been so many in recent yea that a reader may be forgiven if he hesitates in taking up a new one. The is, perhaps, the more excuse in the present instance, because this volume not by a *New Testament* expert, but by a general historian. We believ however, that any such hesitation is not justified in view of the actual pe formance of this book. Its distinctive marks are the sanity and sobrie of judgment with which the controversial problems of the subject a approached. It is well worth while to have the judgment of an experienc historian, possessing a competent acquaintance with the literature of t subject. There may be nothing new in the volume, and the presentation sometimes a little pedestrian, owing to the painstaking thoroughness w which the data are reviewed. But the well balanced correlation of wh we knew before is always a useful service, and most students of the N *Testament,* to say nothing of general readers, will profit by reading t book. As examples of the outstanding quality of balanced judgment wh it displays may be mentioned its discussion of the relation of ethics a eschatology in the teaching of Jesus, the critical handling of His minist of healing, and the appreciation of His historical figure in its distinct originality.

The critical attitude of the book in regard to the sources might described as normal. That is to say, it is based on a reasonable critici of the Synoptics, without disregard of the possible Johannine contributio The central material is divided into "the Galilean Mission" and "t Southern Mission", material for the latter being derived from the Fou Gospel, though with careful criticism. The Virgin birth is rejected, bu real resurrection of Jesus, in the Pauline sense, is accepted. The closi chapter on "The Self-manifestation of Jesus" may leave much to be s in regard to the final evaluation of His Person, but the satisfactory feat of the book is that it affords a foundation in history consistent and convi ing, on which we may proceed to elaborate our Christology. The book n therefore be heartily recommended to students either as a foundation, as a review, of their knowledge of the Jesus of History.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

The Atonement and Social Progress. By SHAILER MATHEWS, D.D. Macmillan. 8s. 6d.

Dean Shailer Mathews here reviews the history of the doctrine of the Atonement, in order to bring out the formative influence of the social environment of Christianity in the successive periods. He rightly urges that the particular form taken by any doctrine is closely related to the general ideas of its age, and especially to the form in which the contemporary society is organized. These influences he designates as the "social pattern". In successive chapters he describes these patterns under the headings of (1) Messianic, (2) Sacrificial, (3) Acquittal, (4) Sonship, (5) Imperialistic, (6) Feudalistic, (7) Monarchic. He then deduces the functional value of these doctrines as being "to meet objections against His (God's) moral right to forgive, springing from contemporary practice" (p. 165). In the final constructive chapter he presents the death of Christ in the "pattern of process", *i.e.*, the pattern drawn from the present dominant conception, namely "our experience of the relation of an organism to its active environment, and of individuals to groups" (p. 185). According to this conception, he identifies God with the personality-evolving elements of the Universe (pp. 185, 187). The life of Christ reveals the true relation of human personality to God, and His death is traced to the mal-adjustment of other men, though the death itself is a victory, not a defeat.

The book is suggestive in its general conception, and informative in its review of the historical development of the doctrine, though some criticisms seem necessary in regard to the treatment of the types. The "ransom" theory, which was a ruling conception between Augustine and Anselm, seems unduly minimized. Also, the distinction between the Catholic and the Protestant conception of the Atonement is hardly drawn with sufficient clearness. It is surprising that more attention is not given to Horace Bushnell, who is one of the most original writers in English on this subject. The chief criticism, however, relates to the constructive chapter of his book. Can it be seriously intended to banish the conception of the sovereignty of God, even though that conception admittedly rests on a metaphor, or "pattern"? The Cross of Christ seems to become an unfortunate incident, and certainly loses that centrality of meaning which it has in the New Testament. With such a conception of God, and of the work of Christ, there can be no Godward reference in the Cross, whilst the author himself seems somewhat doubtful about the appeal of his own presentation. Jesus becomes, indeed, a supreme hero, but where is the Gospel of the Grace of God reconciling a sinful world to Himself?

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

The Vision of God: the Christian Doctrine of the Summum Bonum. By KENNETH E. KIRK. Bampton Lectures. Longmans. 25s.

Dr. Kirk is Reader in Moral Theology in the University of Oxford. A previous book of his condemns the Protestant name "Christian Ethics" as indicating too narrowly a study of principles; "Moral Theology" guides the priest in absolution, while it ought also to afford positive direction in the search for holiness—more fully than has yet been done by any English contributors to catholicizing literature. The unabashed Protestant, however, must continue to believe that principles are the thing; and that the details of conduct are the concern not of any intrusive priest but of God Himself, and of the soul who is God's loyal child by faith in Jesus Christ.

The present volume seeks to show, historically, by what steps the more earnest sections of the non-Protestant communions have been led during

the course of ages into the *right* path. Institutionalism, Rigorism, Formalism—each of these is necessary in its place; each is dangerous if it wor[ks] loose. Dr. Kirk accordingly can blame each of them in turn, and c[ome] praise each in turn, just as he may wish at the moment. Rigorism perha[ps] fares worst. *Hebrews, e.g.*, in view of its reiterated warnings against t[he] ruinous guilt of apostasy, is repeatedly mentioned in terms of reproach. Th[at] there was a solemn truth underlying its terrible warnings is never so mu[ch] as hinted. A reviewer of one of Dr. Kirk's earlier books—not in t[he] *Congregational Quarterly*—contrasted the confidence with which t[he] author was able to call to order the greatest of *N.T.* writers (St. Paul w[as] named in that article) with his microscopic study of each syllable of [the] Lambeth Encyclical. Anglo-Catholicism seems indeed to have reached [a] evolutionary view which implies that the religion of the *N.T.* is immatu[re] in contrast with medievalism, with modern Romanism in its better type[s] and perhaps with Pan-Anglicanism. Protestants will grant that, if th[e] ascetic life was to be practised, such a life might more safely be lived und[er] rule than in the fanatical irresponsibility of a hermit's career. But, ev[en] if the *N.T.* writings foreshadow later asceticism at a few points—notabl[y] in the First Gospel's version of our Lord's final words to the Rich Youn[g] Ruler—there could not well be a more marked contrast than that betwe[en] the atmosphere of the *N.T.* generally and the atmosphere of the cloist[er] or of certain Bampton Lectures.

The peak of revelation seems to be recognized in "St." Thom[as] Aquinas, "St." Ignatius Loyola, and the perfumed and modish piety [of] "St." Francis of Sales[1], who—helped by the *Spiritual Exercises* of t[he] founder of the Jesuits—taught souls living "in the world" how they mig[ht] become virtuosos of holiness, almost as well as if they were living und[er] vows. A concession is made to Protestanism where Works of Supererog[a]tion are transformed by the author into *duties* for this or that individ[ual] soul, as he advances in (or towards) sanctity. The error of distinguishi[ng] two lives, one higher and one lower, is thought to be avoided when it [is] taught that *all* Christians are called to the same career of methodi[cal] devotion, and that *all* come to be growingly hard upon themselves as th[ey] approach the beatific "vision". Service of (God and) man is prelimina[ry] and inferior; worship is sovereign. This is a hard and a perilous sayi[ng]. Behind Dr. Kirk's important question, What is the *Summum Bonum?* which question the *N.T.* answers not in one formula but in several, wh[ich] are mutually complementary, and mainly in three: "the Kingdom of God", "a righteousness of God", "eternal life"—there lies a question of ev[en] greater weight. Who or what is God? According to the Gospels, He [is] our Father. According to St. Paul and 1 *Peter,* He is the God and Fath[er] of our Lord Jesus Christ. Dr. Kirk's deity, on the other hand, bears [a] curious resemblance to the God of Calvinism. For love gives to other[s] freely and bounteously; but such "Theocentricity" as Dr. Kirk preach[es] hardly leaves the creature enough of personality to preserve its ba[re] existence.

What would St. Paul have said of this voluminous, extremely learn[ed] and very well-intentioned book? Or of the circle from which it proceed[s]? Probably he might have repeated what he said in another connexion: I bear them record that they have a zeal for God, but not according to kno[w]ledge . . . For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every o[ne] that believeth". He might even have thought it well to quote E[ph]

[1] In the last two (p. 412), "Christian thought about prayer *reaches its hig[h] water mark.*"

challenging thesis: "To him that worketh not[1], but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness". As such words remind us, legalism is as little able as antinomianism to make any soul Christian. And, if the error of antinomianism is grosser, that of legalism may prove more insidious and more petrifying in its results. Legalism, of course, is Dr. Kirk's standby. He supposes that it holds the field everywhere to-day[2]. But he ought to learn that there are millions of evangelical Protestants to whom the grace of God is neither a scrap of dead tradition, nor a rhetorical annexe to a programme of what an honoured minister once described as "semi-Socialistic stuff", but the life of their souls, and the hope of the whole world, and the unspeakable gift of God Most High.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

The Revelation of Deity. By J. E. TURNER, M.A., Ph.D. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.

This is the third and last of a series of studies. In his previous volumes Dr. Turner, who is a professed realist and dualist (mind and matter) in philosophy, has argued: (1) that the universe necessarily involves a supreme self; (2) that, by equal metaphysical necessity, the supreme self possesses those lofty attributes which justify our calling him GOD. In noticing the second volume—on *The Nature of Deity* (1927)—the present reviewer remarked upon the absence of all reference to Jesus Christ. In a sense, such defect is now amply made good. We have here a really moving statement of Christian thoughts and aspirations. But—is the old procedure really valid? Can the good man and the bad, God's friend and His enemy, reach the same assured results? And what else does metaphysical necessity mean?

By "revelation" Dr. Turner seems to understand material, of one sort or another, from which rational inferences can be drawn. For some Christians, revelation rather means a self-disclosure by God which brings life and peace and joy. The highest of all materials is found by Dr. Turner in the Incarnation or—as its crown—in the Atonement; it is to the author's honour that we may and must add these last words. With inevitable changes, some at least of which are all to the good, he strangely recalls to one Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*. Things had to be just *so;* and we can prove that the saving grace of God was logically inevitable. Psychologically, on the other hand, Dr. Turner reaches his evangelical positions by a somewhat harsh supra-naturalism. The past is utterly hopeless. Men never can "rise by stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things". Only what is "philosophically" (p. 184) an incarnation of God, whether or not also "theologically" (p. 185) so—it *may* be!—makes possible in any degree whatever the transformation of former error and the fulfilment of God's plan for mankind. Repentance, forgiveness, are meaningless—apart from "the sinless years that breathed beneath the Syrian blue". It is a difficult admission to make, even if it secures the help of philosophy—in one of its versions—as a champion of faith in Jesus Christ.

Dr. Turner in this volume seems to swing even more than previously towards Hegelian Idealism. He also repeats his strange assertion of the entire compatibility of determinism with free will. One may observe, finally, that few philosophical books have been so richly supplied with references to past and future sections of the argument. The author has been, one might say, his own editor. It is an interesting experiment.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

1 "Oh, what could I do," said the great and lovable Thomas Chalmers—"what could I do if God did *not* justify the ungodly?".

2 See p. 429.

A Philosophy of Reality. By E. L. Young. Manchester University Press 8s. 6d.

Miss Young advances a type of philosophic Realism that is very much in accord with the increasingly realistic current of modern thought. "It is my main object", she asserts, "to maintain that things are what they seem however much more they may also be; and to show how this seeming can be reconciled with the apparently very different seeming suggested by modern science. All must be included". So far, to my own mind, so good. For it results from this that "nature does not present a mask hiding reality, but a friendly countenance expressing it". It may easily be, of course, that her "new constructive system of philosophy" is not so markedly original as it appears to be to herself. Realism of some such type as this has many able advocates to-day both explicit and implicit—in our own country alone, for example, Laird, Taylor, Alexander, Dawes Hicks, Nunn and Muirhead, to whom must be added the late Dr. Bosanquet and Mr. Bradley. But Miss Young treats her difficult subject in a quite independent and highly attractive way, skilfully dispensing with many of the technicalities which far too often destroy the interest of the cultured reader, to whom her volume may be unqualifiedly recommended. Beginning with "The Greenness of the Grass", she advances to "Good and Evil" and "Progress" as the "Essential Values", while between these two extremes lie Matter and Number, Space and Time, with all their perplexing problems.

Apart from this, however, it is, I suppose, inevitable that every reviewer will discover his own points of difference in so very controversial a field, and in spite of sympathy with her general standpoint, it seems to me erroneous to commence with the principle that "every single thing that we perceive in a table (colour, shape, feel, weight) is actually a sensation in ourselves. The room and the space are also known only as sensation in ourselves". In the first place, are these known as "sensations", or not more accurately as percepts? In other words, is not "sensation" a theoretical abstraction? Again, as I have argued elsewhere, are not colour, shape, *etc.*, "sensed data" and not sensations at all, since the latter term should be reserved to denote mental processes or activities? For the present author, however, the mind finally obtains, or comes to exist within, "the market of objective sensations"; but if this is to be our conclusion, it seems extremely difficult to escape that very mentalism which Miss Young repudiates. The mind, after all, remains "confined to the characters of our private mentality", as Bosanquet has expressed it.

The crucial tests of every Realism will always arise from Space and Time. Despite the distinctions between its objective and subjective aspects, Miss Young affirms that there is a "Time which is not an abstract idea, but is the most fundamental reality of our universe". Similarly Space, regarded as "the absence of the external things, is a concrete reality". These viewpoints afford an excellent foundation for her equally realistic handling of man's higher spiritual experience, even though she makes little claim to orthodoxy in its usual sense. Throughout she shows herself well acquainted with the intricate details of current scientific research, and extremely competent to discuss their philosophic implications clearly; in my opinion, every student of these fascinating problems will value and enjoy the lucid analysis of so many pressing speculative issues.

J. E. Turner.

The Fall of Christianity: a Study of Christianity, the State, and War. By G. J. Heering. Translated from the Dutch by J. W. Thompson. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

This book—the English version of the Dutch original of 1928 (of which

a German translation has already appeared)—is a full-dress attack on the well-worn problem of Christianity and War; or rather, it is a full-dress attack on the Christian Church for having ever taken any other attitude on this problem than the most uncompromising pacifism. The author (who is a theological professor in the Remonstrant Seminary at Leyden University) has succeeded in uniting passionate conviction with the frankest candour in handling objections, and with a sweetness and humility of spirit which will go far to conciliate those of different views.

The first chapter exhibits the pacifism both latent and indeed explicit in the *New Testament* and in pre-Constantinian Christendom, offers an answer to all the usual objections to this reading of *N.T.* teaching, and brings out the change of front involved in the Church's pact with Constantine. Chapter II is a summary of the Christian theories of the State from Paul to the present day. This is followed in Chapter III by a study of the various theories framed (chiefly by German thinkers during the last century and a half) to justify war. Chapter IV takes up the question of the morality of war. Here the author has no difficulty in drawing a truly dreadful picture of the many-sided demoralization (sexual and other) inseparable from war-conditions, and of the boundless and unpreventable destruction incidental to the use of aircraft and poisonous gas. It is in the course of this chapter (on p. 202) that he takes up *seriatim* the arguments usually advanced by non-pacifists in defence of the permissibility of war in certain circumstances—whereof a word presently. The fifth and concluding chapter discusses the task of (*a*) Organized Christianity, and (*b*) the individual Christian; and the conclusion in both cases is in favour of the most uncompromising opposition to war—not as a mere negative, but as an implicate of loyal and positive Christian idealism.

As a readable, reasonable, and well-informed statement of the pacifist case, the book is to be warmly recommended. It is impossible here to touch on the many interesting features it presents: but two points of special interest may be mentioned.

First, as regards the relation between war and police-work. Dr. Heering is not a Tolstoyan. He frankly allows the necessity for restraining criminals by force, even by the corporate exercise of force, and does not rule out on principle all individual use of violence in self-defence. He admits that these things are a compromise which the Christian conscience has to make in an imperfect world. But he denies *in toto* that such a concession carries with it in principle the approval of even occasional warfare. The obvious differences between the two actions compared (chiefly the vast difference in the degree of damage inflicted) are, he contends, amply sufficient to justify the moral admission of the one and the moral condemnation of the other, even though one must grant the existence of certain situations in which the distinction between the two might not be very easy to draw. Such an apologia may strike some as lame: but most problems of practical Christian ethics are dilemmas of one sort or another, the solution of which involves balancing *pros* and *cons*, *i.e.*, calculating questions of degree. The difference, for example, between moderate drinking and drunkenness is purely a question of degree. And I see no reason in the nature of things why, when it is a question of the use of coercion and violence, the difference between the morally right and the morally wrong should not turn on the question of degree. I am therefore prepared to defend Dr. Heering's distinction in principle here, though I believe he would have made his case still stronger, especially as regards the "borderland" situations, had he taken account of the measure of objective value inherent in honest fighting, in which the Christian cannot participate (being

ear-marked for a different treatment of the trouble), but to which he mu in all fairness extend a relative justification.

The other point of special interest is the new complexion given to th whole problem by the portentous development of the means of destructio in the course of the last war and since its close. Dr. Heering has so telling quotations from military and other experts, as well as from record history, from which it appears not only that it is impossible to preve the general adoption of increasingly atrocious weapons of destruction, pr vided only that they are effective, but also that there are no known mea by which a modern city could be defended against wholesale gas attac from the air in any future war. This would, of course, involve the deat in torment, of thousands of helpless civilians (women and children included and the only possible reply to it would be to carry out reprisals on citi full of enemy-civilians. The race-suicide involved in such a conflict obvious. It is a tragic mistake to regard pleas of this kind as simply scar mongering: they are but modest and obvious inferences from well-attest facts. And they do put a new complexion on the whole problem. The make immensely more horrible, and therefore more immoral, the duty the fighter in war-time. They reduce the old plea that the soldier " defending " his country, wife, and children, to a pure farce. And the make all talk of war for the sake of preserving our civilization loo strangely stupid. The argument for Christian pacificism does not inde depend for its validity on this prospect of universal destruction: but tho who are still unconvinced by that argument must admit that the prospect universal destruction does not leave them very much of a leg to stand o

I have noticed a few misprints in the book: on pp. 13, 33, and 109, superfluous and misleading comma on p. 223 (after " tithing "), and absence of full-stops after nearly all the italicized captions between pp. 2 and 280.

C. J. Cadoux.

A Contributive Society. By J. R. Bellerby. Education Services. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Bellerby's book should appeal to all who are hoping to see a bett industrial order brought about primarily by individual action applied fr within industry by men who combine business knowledge with social idea rather than by the imposition of revolutionary theories by any pow operating from without. The author holds that the evils of the prese system are due to a too exclusive dependence upon the acquisitive moti of individual profit, which, of course, cannot be superseded but needs be held in truer balance by the development of a contributive motive, whi he regards as equally natural to man, the two being capable of workin in full harmony. He sees the transition from a society based mainly the motive of private profit to a society giving full weight to the contrib tive motive by three stages. In the first experimental stage a number small scattered groups of individuals combine according to certain rul and principles to base their own business action upon the proper balan of the acquisitive and contributive motives, carrying their principle in action wherever they can and at certain points dissociating themselv from practices which do not admit of this peaceful penetration. The seco stage is still a stage of voluntary co-operation, but it pre-supposes su a large number of individuals convinced by the earlier experiment that t movement is now widespread and influential. In the third stage th pioneer voluntary action has, according to the general precedent of Britis progress, led to incorporation of new features into the legislative machine of the country.

A long and interesting section in the first half of the book examines the strength and effect of the present industrial system under such headings as The Institution of Private Property, The Uses of Private Ownership, The Value of Competition, and The Advantages of the Price and Profit System resultant from a Society organized on the Money Basis. This section is useful in raising issues in a form likely to lead to useful general discussion, quite apart from the value of the special argument of the book which follows.

The chief contribution of the book, however, is the study of the lines along which experimental groups might work towards the penetration of the present order with more contributive ideals. Positing the existence of groups of practical idealists, Mr. Bellerby outlines the probable adjustments which such groups would make voluntarily to their habits of expenditure and to their attitude to the institutions of property, inheritance, and insurance, and their discrimination between points where competition is valuable and where it should be replaced, if possible, by co-operative methods.

Mr. Bellerby is a trained economist, and, one would suppose, a rather conservative economist, and the discussion is, therefore, free from the visionary and hortatory features which business men so often find irritating in books dealing with the reconstruction of industry. It should appeal strongly to all who wish to feel their way constructively toward a better industrial order but are not going to let their dissatisfaction with some of the results and methods of accepted business procedure stampede them into any wild-cat idealistic ventures.

Incidentally there is an interesting chapter on the changes in the education of the country which would help to stimulate the contributive motive.

MALCOLM SPENCER.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading).*

Miss Edna M. Bonser's *The Little Boy of Nazareth* (S.C.M., 6s.), is an attempt to portray the environment of the child Jesus. Many *O.T.* stories are introduced as part of His teaching, and the customary education of the Jewish child worked in. As we read we learn much of the life and work of the village people of Palestine, and children taught by means of this book should be enabled to see Jesus in His home surroundings. There are suggestions for teachers both for individual work, handwork, and dramatization.

In **The World of the New Testament* (Cambridge Press, 6s.), Dr. T. R. Glover does for early Christianity what Miss Bonser attempts to do for the boy Jesus. Everything Dr. Glover writes is well worth reading. He has an expert's knowledge of his subject, and a style that makes reading a pleasure. Here we have the environment of the early Church, and its background—the thoughts, traditions, life, and practice of the Greek, Roman, and Jewish world in which it was born. Dr. Glover's conclusion is worth quoting :

> The Church came into being in a world with great features and great needs and a great inheritance, and . . . it conquered the world because it appealed to a great race on its highest levels.

Somebody seems to have blundered. *Bible Stories and How to Tell Them* (S.C.M., 6s.), and *How To Tell Bible Stories* (N.S.S.U., 2s. 6d.)

both by the Rev. W. J. May, and published about the same time! This seems to be laying up trouble in store for booksellers' assistants, whatever the two publishers have had to say about it. Mr. May has deservedly won a name for himself for his children's stories, though we confess to the heresy of liking his garden talks better than those which deal with the Bible. Here he tries to outline his technique, though probably those who attempt to follow it will discover that personality counts for more than method. We do not agree that Mr. John Oxenham's *The Hidden Year* is lacking in reverence.

There is an interesting story behind Canon Quick's four lectures, *The Realism of Christ's Parables*. The lectures bear the name of Miss Ida Hartley, a Lancashire school mistress who died in 1917 at the age of 32. She was engaged to a young soldier who had saved £300. On his *fiancée's* death he handed this sum to the vicar of Colne, "to be used in memory of Miss Hartley for lectures on religious subjects to Sunday School teachers of the Established and Nonconformist Churches of Colne". A previous series of lectures has been given by Mr. Martin Shaw, and Canon Quick's would prove extremely helpful to those who listened to them. (S.C.M. 2s.).

No American scholar is more respected in this country than Dr. W. Adams Brown, and no one has done more to clarify Christian thinking. In **Pathways to Certainty* (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.), which has an awful jacket, he has given us a very timely book which, while useful to all thinking Christians, would make an admirable basis of discussion in a ministerial study circle. Here are the chapters:

Why a New Book on Religious Certainty.
Why We Need Certainty in Religion.
Ways of Reaching Certainty.
The Way of Authority: or What Others Can Tell us about God.
The Way of Intuition: or Meeting God Face to Face.
The Way of Reasoning: or The Test of Consistency.
The Way of Experiment: or The Practice of the Presence of God.
The Certainty of To-day and the Hope for To-morrow.

Dr. Adams Brown is abreast of current study in philosophy, psychology and science; he has an attractive style, and a spirit inquiring, yet reverent. Germane to the whole of his argument is the belief that

> it is through action rather than through thought alone that religious certainty is finally to be won . . . The enterprise in which we are engaged is not a classroom debate. It is not a laboratory experiment. Reflective thought may analyse the possibilities and marshal the arguments . . . , but of itself it can never carry us beyond probability. Only the will can translate probability into certainty and make the God of whom others have told us real to us.

Canon J. K. Mozley's *The Beginnings of Christian Theology* (Cambridge Press, 5s.), consists of eight addresses broadcast by the B.B.C. last summer. Starting from the *N.T.* background they bring the survey down through the Apologists to the Council of Nicæa.

It was to the loss of Christian learning that Baron Von Hügel was prevented by ill-health from delivering the Gifford Lectures: we could ill spare anything from that rich and pregnant mind. He had read and thought much in preparation for the Lectures, and not only for them, but for a work on *"Agnosticism and Faith,* as exemplified in the religious opinions and writings of Sir Alfred Lyall". In both cases the "Introductions" and some chapters had been written, and these are rescued for us by Mr. E. G. Gardner in *The Reality of God, and Religion and Agnosticism* (Dent, 15s.).

The spirit of the Rev. S. M. Shoemaker's *Realizing Religion* (Nisbet, 3s. 6d.) strongly appeals to us, and it should help Christians who read it. The book, however, seemed to become rather "woolly" as it proceeded: it ought to be remembered that increased religious earnestness is not incompatible with the keenest intellectual activity.

We have found Mr. G. Norman Robbins's *Is the Christian Church Necessary?* (Williams & Norgate, 7s. 6d.) a baffling book. Approaching it with sympathy, and agreeing with almost everything it it—"the Christian doctrine of equal availability", and the rest—we were left cold at the end, the prevailing impression being a desire to discover what it was the book lacked. We cannot think what it is unless it is that Mr. Robbins has spread himself too much, so that the stream which might have driven the wheel meanders round the meadow. Nevertheless it is pleasant in these days to find a lay apologist for the Church. Mr. Robbins is never a superficial or a careless advocate, and his pages deserve the consideration of all those who belong to the Church he finds necessary.

Still another book about *Child Life and Religion* (Williams and Norgate, 7s. 6d.)! This one, which seems to come from America, is by Miss Ilse Forest. It starts well, but scarcely maintains its promise. It was surely not an English publisher's reader who allowed to pass the name of Christopher Robin's begetter as "J. J. Milne".

Mr. E. B. Castle, the Headmaster of Leighton Park School, Reading, has given us in *Fathers and Sons* (Univ. of London Press, 3s. 6d.), yet another volume on adolescence and the training of boys. In the early chapters he deals with the usual topics (once more we express our belief that the extent of masturbation is generally absurdly exaggerated), but in "Body, Mind and Soul" the special knowledge acquired in his school enables him to make a valuable contribution to the study of adolescent religion. The extracts from boys' essays on the Bible, God, and Immorality are revealing, while many a sermon has failed to deliver as clear a message as this paragraph by a boy of 13½:

> One of man's ideas of God which is wrong is that God is a shepherd clothed in white stroking the sheep. I think if, instead of these pictures, pictures of God commanding an army, charging His way through the army of difficulties, and coming through worn, wounded but victorious, were printed, man's idea of God would be greatly improved.

We presumed on reading the Preface to Canon R. H. Malden's *This Church and Realm* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.), that we should have little to do but commend a well-intentioned effort to furnish Anglicans with knowledge about the Church to which they belong. We regret that we have found so much that is misleading that a protest is called for. On p. 13, *e.g.*, we are told that Presbyterianism and Unitarianism "are confined to those parts of the world in which English is spoken". Shades of John Calvin and Socinus! Are there no Presbyterian Churches on the Continent still? On p. 35 we learn that the Reformed Churches, the Scotch Presbyterians, and the English Nonconformists, "habitually use the title *Protestant*, and have no desire to qualify it in any way". Has Canon Malden never read that Congregationalists, at any rate, claim to have a conception of the Church far more catholic than any Roman or Anglican has reached? On p. 93 we are informed that the Church of England "is probably the only communion in the world which has been wise enough to secure this liberty (of Biblical interpretation) for itself", while on the previous page it is said that the Church of England

> "has caused the Bible to be better known and more respected amongst its members than anywhere else in the world", the exception in favour of Scotland being explained because "most Scotch Presbyterians only know the Bible through the translations produced by the Church of England. They have never made an English version of their own".

Does Canon Malden not know how long the Genevan version had sway in this country? And can those who made it be called anything but Presbyterians? And does he really believe that Anglican preaching, the exposition of the Bible, was ever comparable with that of the Free Churches? But he regards it as a "proof of national honesty", and extremely significant, that "the Chancellor of the Exchequer often receives more than he had expected from income-tax". The logic is not very satisfactory in either case.

Canon Malden has written this book with the laudable object of helping the ordinary Anglican to understand his Church better, for this he rightly thinks is essential to the cause of unity. It is a pity that much useful instruction is intermingled with things the ordinary Anglican will have to unlearn some day.

Rabindranath Tagore's Hibbert Lectures, *The Religion of Man* (Allen and Unwin, 7s. 6d.), fills us with profound discouragement and even dismay. It is not merely that they reveal the great gulf fixed between the Hindu and the British mind and the entire contrast between the Indian and British *ethos,* but they show not the slightest effort on the part of one of India's most famous sons to understand Christianity, the greatest Western religion—if so it may be called. We read:

> The idea of the divinity of our God, or the divinity of Man in the Eternal, is the main subject of this book.

Yet there is not a single mention of the Incarnation, or of Jesus, and no attempt to get a point of contact with those who believe in God's revelation in Him.

There is one ground for hope—Tagore believes that *Robinson Crusoe* is the best book for boys that has ever been written. Let us cling to that.

We enthusiastically recommend Professor John Laird's **Morals and Western Religion* (Arnold, 7s. 6d.) to all students of theology and ethics. It pre-supposes a good deal of knowledge on the part of the reader and an acquaintance with modern terminology, but it is as fruitful a discussion as any we have recently seen. Cast in the dialogue form, the participants are:

> Wilbur B. Haslett, Dean of Deans in the Stamford Cloyne University, Johnson, Calif;
>
> Mrs. Anastasia Hacopian, formerly Associate Professor of Philosophy and Psychology in Lago College, Drayton, Pa.;
>
> Miss Lettice Gotto;
>
> Dr. David Wilson, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Canberra University.
>
> D. J. Munro, Esq., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Leuchars, Scotland;
>
> J. L. Fixby, Esq., Fellow of Gloucester Hall, Oxbridge;
>
> P. R. Duff, Esq., Editor of *The Journal of Metaphysics;*
>
> The Rev. T. Elder Bowie, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegetics, McCheyne Seminary, Dairsie, N.S.

Miss Gotto is a very lively and likeable lady. Mrs. Hacopian is what the younger generation call (or used to call) "a scream"; how Professor Laird has managed to get inside her skin and use her polysyllabic vocabulary is marvellous. We can do no more than indicate the subjects of the seven dialogues:

I. Concerning Western Religion; II. Concerning Ethics; III. Sacred and Secular; IV. The Sufficiency of Humanism; V. The Problem of Evil; VI. The Law and Grace; VII. The Metaphysical Aspect.

eaders who like something on which to bite their teeth could not do better an get this book.

Professor Ernest Barker has written a characteristically able Introiction to a new translation of St. Augustine's *The City of God* (Dent, . 6d.), a reprint in one volume of the three-volume Temple Classics lition.

The *Men of Conviction* (Scribners, 8s. 6d.), with whom Dean H. B. ashburn, of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., deals these Bohlen Lectures are Athanasius, Benedict, Hildebrand, Francis, yola, and Pius IX, of whom Athanasius and Francis are, he thinks, der-valued in modern times, and the remaining four neglected. All the idies are sympathetic, that of the Pope especially so.

Dr. W. D. Maxwell's *The Liturgical Portions of the Genevan Service ok* (Oliver and Boyd, 12s. 6d.) is a piece of efficient and thorough reirch of a type it is always pleasant to meet. Dr. Maxwell's interests e mainly liturgical, and here he examines the contents of the book used Knox when minister of the English exiles at Geneva 1556-59. In the ry of the Marian exiles the clue to much of the subsequent history of otestantism and Nonconformity is to be found, and we are glad that ention is being turned to this period. Dr. Maxwell might have found ne help in the story of English Puritanism after the return of the exiles England.

In Defence of the Reformation (Wessex Press, Taunton, 5s.), consists three lectures delivered by Dr. G. G. Coulton in Liverpool on "Inibility", "Persecution", and "The Reformation", together with the l and written discussions which ensued. It is a typical Coulton productn, though not so full as Volume II of *Romanism and Truth* (Faith Press, 6d.). In this volume, which is called "The Struggle against Commonse", Dr. Coulton ranges over a wide field. He deals with Infallibility, Index, the Papal treatment of Houtin, Duchesne, Loisy, Tyrrell, and George Mivart; with the Roman Church's attitude to politics (especially sidering the case of Governor Al Smith, of New York), education, tory, and truth. The two volumes form a *vade mecum* for all those aged in controversy with Romanist propagandists.

Mr. J. W. Poynter's literary activity is incessant, and Romanists are ning to fear him almost as they do Dr. Coulton. *Rome at Close arters* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.) is, in the main, autobiophical. It tells of the author's admission into the Roman Catholic urch, his enthusiastic service for it, and his subsequent disillusionment. e sincerity of the narrative is obvious, but Mr. Poynter would be well ised, in the interests of his cause, to curb a growing tendency quotation.

Ministers should make a point of seeing Dr. C. A. Alington's *The Task Happiness* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.), for it is a little book they would do well to ommend to parents. Heading his sections "Foundations", "The ne", and "Children" Dr. Alington writes both pleasantly and helpfully. would be a good thing for the English home—and therefore for the glish nation—if the volume were widely read.

Religions of the World: Their Nature and History (Harrap, 15s.) is a iposite work, translated from the German by the Rev. A. K. Dallas.

The Editor is Professor Carl Clemen, of the University of Bonn, who hi self writes the chapters on " Prehistoric ", " Primitive ", Persian, a Celtic Religion. " Christianity " is given 100 pp. the writer bei Professor Erich Seeberg, of Berlin. We scarcely think the style is popu enough to reach the general reader for whom the volume is intended, but t numerous illustrations help. More might have been done to bring t different contributions into a measure of uniformity : the bibliography Islam occupies seven lines only, compared with nine times that number f Christianity.

Professor Henry Bett's *Joachim of Flora,* the second volume in t "Great Medieval Churchmen" series (Methuen, 6s.), is welcome becau there is so little about Joachim in English. Mr. Bett gives a summa of what is known of Joachim's life, and outlines his doctrine of the thr dispensations, "the progress of revelation through an age of God t Father, an Age of God the Son, and a final age of God the Spirit". T book, however, is a study of Joachism rather than of the monk from who it took its name, and Mr. Bett has to describe the University of Paris a its quarrels in detail before he can relate them to the publication of *T Eternal Gospel* in 1254. An account of "the Spiritual Franciscans" follow and we see how Joachim's teaching has developed into a theory whi makes "Joachim the St. John the Baptist, St. Francis the Christ, and t Franciscans the Apostles, of a final evangel of the Holy Spirit".

1931 being the centenary of Faraday's "greatest discovery—the deriv tion of Electricity from Magnetism", Mr. Rollo Appleyard has written *Tribute to Michael Faraday* (Constable, 7s. 6d.), in which he describ Faraday's experiments and achievements, stressing the scientist rath than the man himself.

Twenty-eight people, including the Prime Minister, Mr. Havelo Ellis, Mr. Laurence Housman, and Mr. H. W. Nevinson, co-operate *Edward Carpenter : An Appreciation,* edited by Mr. Gilbert Beith. Perha the most useful sketches are those by Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson and M H. S. Salt. The volume would have been more serviceable had a chro logical table and a list of Carpenter's writings been added. Allen & Unv (7s. 6d.).

"Ephesian" (Mr. C. E. Bechhover Roberts) has a suitable subject f his irony in Madame Blavatsky, whose life he has written under the ti *The Mysterious Madame* (Bodley Head, 7s. 6d.). It is difficult to separ fact from fiction in considering Madame Blavatsky's life, but Mr. Robe makes a valiant attempt. While he makes full use of all the lying a fraud in the story, he does not accept without qualification the finding the Committee of the Society of Psychical Research that she was "one the most accomplished, ingenious, and interesting impostors in history his conclusion is that "no one however hostile can regard her without pi and admiration", and "her real nature must still remain to some extent mystery".

Miss M. I. Slater's *Isabel Price, Pioneer* (Livingstone Press, 2s.), is vivid account of the life of a pioneer missionary's wife in Africa. It enab us to realize how much women endured and suffered in missionary ent prise.

Dr. G. B. Harrison's *A Second Elizabethan Journal* (Constable, 24s.) "a record of those things most talked of during the years 1595-159 From all kinds of sources (which we wished he indicated page by pa instead of at the end of the volume) he has culled all manner of topi references to people and events during these four years. Witchcr

appears several times, but there is comparatively little about ecclesiastical affairs, though we note in October, 1595:

> Sir Walter Ralegh is now in London, and goes daily to hear sermons, because he hath seen the wonders of the Lord in the deep; 'tis much commended and spoken of.

There is a reference to the "Brownists' Confession" printed at Amsterdam n 1596, about which Dr. Harrison seems to hold that "this pamphlet argely confirms the opinions held by the authorities of the seditious nature of Brownism".

An interesting selection, which illustrates the tastes of its compiler as well as the life of the times.

The Social and Political Ideas of Some Representative Thinkers of the Revolutionary Era (Harrap, 7s. 6d.), is the sixth series of King's College ectures, edited by Professor Hearnshaw. The lectures are as follows: 'The Theorists of the American Revolution" (Prof. R. McElroy), "The Early English Radicals" (Prof. G. S. Veitch), "The Revolutionary Era n France" (Prof. J. Holland Rose), "Edmund Burke" (Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw), "Thomas Paine" (Dr. Norman Sykes), "William Godwin" Mr. C. H. Driver), "Jeremy Bentham" (Prof. J. W. Allen), "The Socialist Tradition in the French Revolution" (Prof. H. J. Laski), and "The German Thinkers of the Revolutionary Era" (Prof. H. G. Atkins).

It seems a pity that there is not more co-ordination between Professors of Education. In August, 1930, Professor J. W. Adamson wrote the Preface to his survey, *English Education, 1789-1902,* which we have already noticed. In October, 1930, Professor Frank Smith, of Newcastle, wrote he Preface of *A History of English Elementary Education, 1760-1902* University of London Press, 10s. 6d.) now published, a competent and useful piece of work. But how much better if the two had compared notes, nd one of them had dealt with the tangled education story during the present century!

The Rev. G. C. Binyon's *The Christian Socialist Movement in England* S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.), is a note-book rather than a book. He calls it "An ntroduction to the Study of Its History", and it is really material for istory—short sketches of the main personalities and episodes, and an outne of the movement. It is, too, overwhelmingly Anglican; apart from ne Browning Settlement, Mr. Binyon glances at little outside his own enomination.

What is superstition? Apparently Christianity. Who are the *Slayers f Superstition* (Watts, 3s. 6d.)? The Deists, and especially Toland and ollins, Wollaston and Tindal, Woolston and Chubb, Hume, Gibbon, and oltaire? Who is Mr. E. Royston Pike, the writer of this popular account? man who believes that in the 17th century there "were many in the hurch of England who denounced the evil policy of persecution, but very ew who took that line in the ranks of the Independents", and that in the 8th "Dissenting ministers were worse educated and hence more bigoted han their brethren of the Established". 'Nuff said.

L. T. Hobhouse: His Life and Work (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is a olume admirably conceived and executed. After an Introduction by Mr. . P. Scott comes a memoir by Mr. J. A. Hobson, a study of Hobhouse's ork by Dr. Morris Ginsburg, and a selection of articles and essays, aptly nosen to illustrate Hobhouse's many interests and his method. How uch better than a long, wearisome biography filled out with all manner unnecessary details! Particularly interesting are the pages dealing with obhouse's work on the *Manchester Guardian* and the ill-fated *Tribune,*

at Oxford and the London School of Economics. We get the impressio of a fine courageous mind—one student says there was about him "th romance of an intellectual pioneer"—perhaps prevented from doing h best work by a constitutional restlessness which expressed itself in man ways. We have the delightful story of Botha and De Wet staying wit Hobhouse at Wimbledon. Mrs. Hobhouse took them to a livery stable t get a mount, and the keeper anxiously enquired, "But can the gentlem ride?".

Miss Miriam Young, who has lived in India for 25 years, for thr years lived with a friend in an Indian village, trying to model the externa of daily life on that of the villagers. They were greatly helped by Brahmani woman, Sarsuti by name, and round her story *Seen and Heard i a Punjab Village* (S.C.M., 5s.) has been written.

The Negro in American Civilisation (Constable, 20s.) is called "A Stud of Negro Life and Race Relations in the Light of Social Research". Edite by Dr. C. S. Johnson, it is the result of a Commission formed by sixtee organizations working among Negroes and for the improvement of th relationships between white and coloured people in the United States. Th first part discusses various aspects of the problem—homes, schools, ed cability, law observance, health, citizenship, and the like; the secon gives the discussion of the problem at a representative conference. Then is a 25 pp. bibliography, and the volume should for a long time serve as book of reference.

Many books on the population question have recently seen the ligh Now we have a series of eight lectures by Dr. James Bonar, who has pr viously written on Malthus. This account, *Theories of Population fro Raleigh to Arthur Young* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) does not claim to b more than an introduction, but it is well-documented, and clears the grou for any student who wants to investigate the problem in the nineteenth a twentieth centuries.

Mr. A. C. F. Beales, the author of *The History of Peace* (Bell, 16s makes the naïve confession that his interest "in the history of the Pea idea" was first stimulated by acquiring a second-hand copy of a *Life* Henry Richard in 1926. His " Short Account of the Organized Mov ments for International Peace " provides a much-needed book of referenc We hope that a cheap edition will not long be delayed.

Sir Bernard Pares introduces *Glimpses of High Politics Through W and Peace, 1855-1929* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.), the autobiography of N. V Tcharykow, who died in 1930 at the age of 75. Tcharykow is describe on the title-page as "Serf-owner, Ambassador, Exile", and the reminiscences cover all three periods, though the earlier part of the diplo matist's life gets most attention. The final chapters are "Sidelights on th Great War" and "Under the Shadow of Bolshevism". Tcharykow write well—he was educated in Scotland—and it is well that we have the records of a type that has passed, or is passing, away.

We are glad to have Miss Jane Addams's *The Second Twenty Years Hull House* (Macmillan, 17s.) although the title is altogether misleading The volume is in no sense a description or report of the work at Hu House from 1909 to 1929, though the activities of the famous settleme colour every page. It may rather be called "Pages from the Autobiograp of the First Woman in America". Miss Addams tells of her experiences i the Women's Movement in the years preceding, during, and subsequen to the War. She discusses the ten years of prohibition, the immigratio laws, and the efforts to humanize justice, and altogether gives us a stirrin account of a very active period.

There is an interesting account of Roosevelt seeing Galsworthy's *Justice* presented by the Hull House players, and being so impressed that he purchased all the works of Galsworthy he could lay his hands on so that he could, between Chicago and New York, learn more about an author whose work he had not previously met.

All who know Miss Addams and the work at Hull House will read the book: we hope many others will do so.

Sir Frederic Kenyon writes a wise little Introduction to Mr. W. H. Boulton's well-illustrated book, *The Romance of the British Museum* (Sampson Low, 12s. 6d.). Mr. Boulton has not written a guide-book, but the kind of book one ought to study before paying a visit to the British Museum so as to prepare the mind and decide on specific things to see, and so save time. All the collections are treated, and the book can be recommended to all who desire to visit and know more about one of the most remarkable institutions in the world.

The genealogical particulars in Sir Maurice de Bunsen's Foreword to *Elizabeth Fry's Journeys on the Continent 1840-41* (Bodley Head, 12s. 6d.) are a bit bewildering, but when once we gather that Sir Maurice's mother, Elizabeth Gurney, was Mrs. Fry's niece, all becomes plain sailing. Mr. E. Brimley Johnson writes the Introduction, and the letters are the outspoken, unsophisticated chatter of a young woman delighted with the continent. She calls herself "the hem of Mrs. Fry's garment", and it is interesting to see the esteem in which her aunt was everywhere held. There is a significant sentence in the Foreword, where Sir Maurice tells of how the Gurney family never abandoned some Quaker practices "although, with almost all of them, the Meeting House was replaced as time passed by the services of the Church".

We wish all young ministers would set to work to write a history of their church as workmanlike as the Rev. W. E. Harding's *The History of Park Congregational Church, Ramsbottom* (Bury Times, 5s. and 3s.). Founded in 1798, this church set on a hill has an interesting story, and the facts now gathered together afford many illustrations of the religious life of the last century.

Mr. J. E. McGee's *A Crusade for Humanity* (Watts, 21s.) is a "History of Organized Positivism in England". Its excessive price (there are only 239 pp.) is no doubt due to the fact that it is an American production. A couple of generations or so ago there were many who thought that the "Religion of Humanity" was destined to be the religion of the future. How many people think so now? Mr. McGee deals in turn with Comte, Congreve, and Harrison, and their respective activities, and then with the decline of the movement, bringing out the influence of the tenets of Positivism on the religious and political life of England. His survey fills a gap, and will serve as a very handy book of reference. But where is the Index?

In 1928 the Indian Legislature set up a committee of Indians, known as the Age of Consent Committee, to investigate "the nature, extent, and importance" of child-marriage among Hindus. Its Report and the evidence presented have been summarized by Miss Katherine Mayo in *Volume Two* (Jonathan Cape, 7s. 6d.). This practice affords another illustration of the chasm between East and West.

Miss Hebe Spaull's *Pioneering for Peace* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), the account of work being done for the League of Nations all over the world, is just the kind of book to give to adolescents to make them realize the ideals and accomplishments of the League.

Miss Virginia Woolf writes an Introduction to *Life as We Have Know It* (Hogarth Press, 5s.) which, edited by Miss Margaret Llewelyn Davie (for many years Secretary of the Co-operative Women's Guild) is the wor of Co-operative Working Women. All social reformers would be n worse for reading these vivid accounts of women's life as it really is.

Children who listened to Miss Rhoda Power's *Stories from Everywhe* (Evans, 4s. 6d.) will unite with children who read them for the first tim in hailing with delight the volume which contains them. The dedicatio is sufficient in itself to explain Miss Power's success :

> To Imogen Garrett
> Who once asked me why I troubled to
> write history when there were such
> things as fairy tales.

The Rev. A. G. Pite's *Christian Marriage and Modern Practice* (S.C.M 3s. 6d.), is a strangely unsatisfying book. Much of the counsel it offe is eminently sane, but at times Mr. Pite becomes very dogmatic, while a others he speaks with a propriety which is almost Victorian. We hoped t find that the book was one we could hand to those about to be married a well as to couples trying hard to solve the marriage problem for themselve but for that book we still wait. It is one that is urgently needed.

In *Those Obstinate Questionings* (Independent Press, 1s.) Mrs. A. D Lindsay continues the argument begun in *Birth Control and Huma Integrity*. It is a pity that Mrs. Lindsay has not a simpler style, for sh has something very useful to say. Here she discusses

> the confusion that comes from at once over- and under-rating the sexual ac So that our disease being quantity without quality of population, the pr posed remedy is quality regardless of quantity of intercourse.

An important part of the book is the description of the constructive wo being done in the Pioneer Health Centre in London, where contraceptiv have their right and proportionate place in the advice and treatment give

Sir George Newman follows in a striking succession of Halley Stewa Lecturers—Sir Oliver Lodge, Bishop Gore, Professor Gilbert Murray, a Dr. R. H. Tawney. In his Lectures, *Health and Social Evolution* (All and Unwin, 4s. 6d.), he speaks on a subject he has made his own, t chapters indicating the line of his treatment :

> I. How England Learned to Control Disease; II. The Contribution of t Eighteenth Century; III. Health Problems of the Modern Period; IV. T Coming of Democracy and the New Spirit; V. Modern Collective Humanis at Work; VI. Gains and Losses in National Health.

Sir George has the advantage over many doctors in that he is able to mak himself understood—it seems the last thing some members of the professi wish to do. He has a beautifully clear style, and easily "gets across what he has to say. While it is pleasant to hear of medicine's conquest sad experience almost every day makes us realize in how many fiel medical science is still baffled, and not merely in diseases like cancer : it more than time that children's diseases like scarlet fever and whoopi cough were stamped out.

We are glad that Sir J. G. Frazer has gathered together from vario periodicals the essays, addresses, and reviews contained in *Garner Sheaves* (Macmillan, 21s.). It is always a delight to read Sir Jame English, even though one might not be able always to understand h anthropology ! Most of these papers, however, can be followed by tho without technical knowledge, and the volume should prove a delightf companion to many for a long evening.

The delivery of a series of wireless addresses is the new method of trying out a book. Sir James Jeans's *The Stars in their Courses* (Cambridge Press, 5s.) consists of expanded wireless talks, based on the assumption that listeners had no knowledge of "the most poetical of the sciences", to which they were to be "an easy, readable, and not over-serious introduction". For its readability we can vouch; we are almost tempted to set up a telescope immediately.

Professor H. J. Laski has written a little *Introduction to Politics* (Allen and Unwin, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.), in which he deals in more popular fashion with some of the problems discussed in his *Grammar of Politics*. His four chapters deal with "The Nature of the State", "The Place of the State in Society", "The Organization of the State", and "The State and the International Community". A timely little book.

In *Work: What It Has Meant to Man Through The Ages* (Harrap, 7s. 6d.), Miss D. C. Fisher has given us a free translation from the Italian of a book by Signor Adriano Tilgher. While not without suggestion the survey is far too rapid and cursory to be of much service. Greek, Roman, Hebrew, Medieval, Lutheran, Calvinistic, and "Rationalist" conceptions of work lead up to accounts of the way Marx, Hegel, Ruskin, Tolstoi, Bolshevism, Fascism, and Americanism regard work; and then play, sport, luxury, *etc.*, have to be discussed—all in 220 pages.

Mr. Basil Mathews's *The Clash of World Forces* (Livingstone Press, 2s.) follows *The Clash of Colour* and *Young Islam on Trek*. It is not the best of the three, but it states, in the picturesque fashion of which Mr. Mathews is master, the salient facts about Nationalism (in Europe, India, and China) and Bolshevism, and shows how Christianity and Internationalism can meet universal claims.

We have frequently commended the volumes in the "*World Dominion* Survey Series". They cost far more to produce than the charge that is made for them, and many of them contain information that is not to be found elsewhere. The two volumes before us (5s. each) are *Religion and Civilization in West Africa,* by the Rev. J. J. Cooksey and the Rev. Alexander McLeish, and *The Northern Republics of South America,* by Mr. K. G. Grubb, which deals with Ecuador, Columbia, and Venezuela,

Readers can spend a pleasant half-hour turning over the pages of Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith's *Afterthoughts,* which may be called a footnote to his *Treasury of English Aphorisms*. Here are one or two of them:

> It is the misery of young people that they have to read each other's books.
>
> I hate having books forced down my throat; but how I love forcing them down the throats of other people!
>
> What humbugs we are, who pretend to live for Beauty, and never see the Dawn!
>
> What sight in the world is sadder than the sight of a lady we admire admiring a nauseating picture?
>
> Style is a magic wand, and turns everything to gold that it touches.
>
> There is more felicity on the far side of baldness than young men can possibly imagine.

O World Invisible (Benn, 6s.) is an anthology of religious poetry compiled by Mr. Edward Thompson, a name which is in itself a guarantee that no unworthy poem will have secured admission. It also assures that India will not have been overlooked: indeed, some will think it is overrepresented. It is annoying that the items do not indicate their source: one has to turn to the end of the book every time. The only thing to be

said in favour of this plan is that it keeps the reader humble to discove how many selections he is unable to identify. Some names—Campion George Herbert, Vaughan, Keble, Ken, Whittier, and F. W. H. Myer we naturally expect to find, though it is surprising that there is no Brown ing. Can Thomas Naylor be James Nayler, we wonder?

Herr Erich Maria Remarque's *The Road Back* (Putnam, 7s. 6d.) is marke by the same characteristics as *All Quiet on the Western Front*—the sam realism, and the same 18th century frankness about natural processes— and it is even more horrible. It is not a novel in the sense that it has plot, but rather a description of the effect of the War on the minds an characters of some of those who took part in it. We see th last few hours at the Front in 1918, the return home, the futil attempts of men to accommodate themselves to life without war—its horror and its comradeship— and the pathetic failure of the folks at home t understand them or realize what they had been through. The easy assump tion of parents, teachers, and others that men would be just the same o their return and take up life where they had laid it down was as strange a it was certain to meet with disillusionment. A powerful book, which would do some people a world of good to read—though unfortunately th wrong people will read it!

EDITOR.

The Very Rev. R. O. P. Taylor, late Provost of Cumbræ Cathedra writes interestingly and suggestively on the relation of religion and scienc in *The Meeting of the Roads* (Nisbet, 6s.). Dr. Taylor has been all h life a student of science, and he is confident that religion and science a not really at variance. Some of his suggestions seem biased, but the u shot of it all is a fascinating book. Its general position is that "Faith do not shut its eyes to repeat its creed".

Studies of Judas Iscariot seem to have a strange hold on us, and suppose it is because we feel with Hazlitt, in the essay, that one would li to "see the face of the man who, having dipped his hand in the same di with the Son of Man, could afterwards betray Him". In *Jesus and Jud* (Hodder, 6s.) the Rev. S. Pearce Carey returns to the subject, and gives a careful study of the relation between Judas and the Master. Mr. Car accepts the Biblical narratives almost as they are. Probably we sh never know the inwardness of why Judas ever became a disciple at all; b the treatment of the whole problem in this book is fresh, and brings mar things into a clearer light.

Put briefly, and as nearly as I can in Dr. A. C. Hill's own words, th substance of his book *The Tragic Faith* (Gardner, 6s.) is that: (1) Chri meets the essential tragedy of human life, its deep shadow and its sin, wit a faith that centres in the Cross; and (2) nothing but this "tragic faith will meet the case. There is a very great deal in this that deserves co sideration (it is virtually what Coleridge believed), and Dr. Hill works h points out with the help of an extraordinarily wide reading, and a positiv touch on life. All one regrets is a tendency to overstatement; as if i forgot, for example, that Shakespeare's final word on life is not *Lear*, *Macbeth,* but the *Tempest.* But this may be only a wrong impressi gathered from the enthusiasm and conviction of Dr. Hill's way of writing still, I feel that with a quieter style the book would be even more effectiv

Mr. H. W. B. Joseph, Lecturer in Philosophy at Oxford, has publish in *Some Problems in Ethics* (Milford, 5s.) the material of eight lectur which he delivered at New College last year. They deal with difficu questions, some of which are constantly cropping up: *e.g.,* What mak

an action right? What is the relation between rightness and obligation? What is the nature of the goodness of a right action? The discussion is rather recondite in places, and it would be easier to follow if Mr. Joseph could find a more living set of illustrations for his points. But the book is valuable, and it will be highly appreciated by students of ethics. Perhaps it would be clearer to the less agile of us if Mr. Joseph would forswear long, involved sentences : there is one beginning on p. 118 which runs to 24 lines.

The Bishop of Liverpool's *Our Father* (Nisbet, 2s. 6d.) has been written, he says, for the ordinary man. It is a somewhat general, but very sincere, talk on questions of faith in the light of the new knowledge. It may be that Dr. David wants to take the ordinary man too easily towards his own goal. But then the question arises, "Who is this so-called ordinary man?". One so seldom meets him.

A. T. S. James.

Dr. Müller-Lyer's study *The Family* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) is one of a series of volumes on "Stages of Human Evolution". It is, however, quite complete in itself, though it represents only one phase of what the author calls "the geneomonic development of mankind". The book deals with the development of the institution of the family from pre-historic times to the present day, and provides a very full and elaborately illustrated discussion of the whole subject. In dealing with the early period the author lays much stress on the action of economic need and economic convenience in regulating marriage and in producing what is afterwards known as the family. The same influences are operative in regulating the relations between the family and the tribe or sept, and retain their importance in those later family phases where ethical and religious considerations have much freer play. In the latter part of the book there are some very interesting discussions in regard to the development of the family under these last named influences and the emergence of the importance of the individual and of personality in the family and social order. The book is a real contribution to a very important aspect of sociology. It has been well translated by Miss F. W. Stella Browne, who has also added to it a large number of translator's notes, all of which are useful, but some of them in their suggestive criticisms going rather beyond the strict province of the translator.

There seems no end to the publication of books on psychology and its relation to religion, and many of them are quite superfluous. That is not the case with Dr. Barbour's **Sin and the New Psychology* (Allen & Unwin 5s.). He has a specific subject and he keeps himself to it pretty rigidly. The subject, too, is one that needed treating from a definitely Christian standpoint. The "New Psychology", with its tendency to substitute complexes for sin, really rules sin out, and in so doing blunders badly in its interpretation of human nature. Dr. Barbour discusses the whole question afresh with full knowledge of the teaching of Christianity on the subject, on the one hand, and of the findings of Freud, Jung, Adler, and the behaviourists, on the other. His book is a real contribution to the subject and should be read by every minister and theological student.

Dr. J. B. Pratt has laid us all under his debt by his books on the Religious Consciousness and on Buddhism, and he very definitely increases the debt in *Adventures in Philosophy and Religion* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.). In some respects it is a *tour de force* and is carried through with immense vigour and shrewdness. The greater part of the book is occupied by a Socratic dialogue entitled "Socrates' Adventures in Wonderland" or "The Damning of Dualism". Socrates is represented as coming forth from Limbo and entering into the familiar type of discussion with Dr. Idealist, Professors Pragmatist and Neo-Realist, Dr. Behaviourist, and others. The

spirit of the Platonic dialogues is admirably reproduced, and while there is some excellent fooling, the whole thing is entirely serious and these new types of philosophy are subjected to an extremely damaging and convincing criticism. There are three other shorter dialogues on "Religion Up to Date", "Immortality", "Buddhism and Christianity". These show the same qualities and each is a real contribution to the discussion of the subject both positive and critical. The whole book makes very lively and interesting reading.

W. B. SELBIE.

It would be difficult to find a better illustration of the ludicrous than a theory of laughter propounded with humourless solemnity. Those in search of this kind of absurdity will not, however, discover it in *A Theory of Laughter,* by Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, M.A. (Allen & Unwin, 5s.). The book is serious and thoughtful, as must be any book given to honest theorizing, but it is not portentous, and it is comforting to the reader in proportion to his capacity for merriment. Mr. Menon's explanation of the nature of laughter is dependent upon the broad validity of Prof. McDougall's conception of the instinctive basis of mind, and it marks a real advance in the discussion of the problem. He does not confine himself narrowly to his subject, but treats (and not irrelevantly) of art in general and of comedy and tragedy in particular, with much interesting comment on Shakespearian practice.

E. R. MICKLEM.

In *Studies in the Psalms* (Oxford Press, 5s.) Dr. S. Daiches gives us four careful studies regarding the Hebrew terms *adam, ben adam, goim, etc.,* and the doubtful text of *Ps.* 2. A valuable work for the specializing student.

J. P. NAISH.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, Etc.

W. R. INGE. *Protestantism.* Benn. 3s. 6d. Essex Library.

J. H. PENNIMAN. *A Book about the English Bible.* Milford (University of Pennsylvania Press). 8s. 6d. 2nd Ed.

A. M. PULLEN. *The Invisible Sword.* Independent Press. 2s.

ERNEST DIMNET. *The Brontë Sisters;* HOLBROOK JACKSON, *The Eighteen Nineties.* Cape. 4s. 6d. each. "Life and Letters" series.

LORD HOUGHTON. *Life of John Keats.* Milford. 2s. "World's Classics."

J. C. MEGGITT. *Impressions of a World Tour.* Interesting impressionist articles reprinted from the *Western Mail and South Wales News,* especially informing in regard to Australia and New Zealand.

ALSO RECEIVED.

JOHN NEALE DALTON. *The Psalms: A Suggested Revision of The Prayer Book Version and Twelve Old Testament Canticles.* Cambridge Press. 7s. 6d.

Mrs. GUY ROGERS. *Morning Prayers and Readings for School and Family.* S.C.M. 3s. and 2s.

P. B. BULL. *Science and Faith on Life, Death and Immortality.* Faith Press. 3s. and 2s.

M. O. PELTON and V. E. WALKER. *When Jesus was Here.* N.S.S.U. 2s. Simple Gospel stories for children.

R. PYKE. *Points for Protestants.* Epworth Press. 2s. 6d. Brief chapters stating the case against Roman Catholicism.

A. W. HARRISON. *The Faith of a Christian.* Ludgate Circus House. 1s. A manual intended primarily for young people being prepared for Church membership.

L. E. COX. *The Way.* Ludgate Circus House. 1s. "A Book of Prayer Help".

ROBERT LEE. *The Outlined Acts.* Pickering and Inglis. 3s

SABEL PLATT, *Wayfarers' Rest,* 1s. 6d. AMY LE FEUVRE, *Some Builders,* 2s. 6d. L. A. BARTER SNOW, *Agnes Dewsbury,* 2s. 6d. CHARLOTTE MURRAY, *Coral,* 2s. 6d. D. M. BARTER SNOW, *The Long Pursuit,* 1s. 6d. MARJORIE DOUGLAS, *Margaret's Story,* 2s. 6d. Pickering and Inglis.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, Etc.

). C. QUICK. *Philosophy and the Cross.* Milford. 2s. 6d. Two Riddell Memorial Lectures.

I. H. BRINTON. *Creative Worship.* Allen and Unwin. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. Swarthmore Lecture.

. R. BUXTON. *The Race Problem in Africa.* Hogarth Press. 1s. The Merttens Lecture, 1931.

OHN MASEFIELD. *Chaucer.* Cambridge Press. 2s. The Leslie Stephen Lecture delivered at Cambridge, 3rd March, 1931. A delightful talk, especially when we have "The Cat killed the Rat" according to Homer, Dante, and Wordsworth.

A. HOBSON. *Towards Social Equality.* Oxford Press. 2s. L. T. Hobhouse Memorial Trust Lecture, No. 1.

ENDEL HARRIS. *Egypt and the Volga; St. Kilda, The Azores and the Brazil Islands; Maeldune; Semo Sancus.* Heffer. 2s. each. "Sunset Essays," IX—XII.

. S. ELIOT. *Thoughts after Lambeth;* JAMES JOYCE. *Haveth Childers Everywhere.* Faber and Faber. 1s. "Criterion Miscellany." We quote one of Mr. Joyce's lucid sentences at random, reminding readers that "to confess that you find Mr. Joyce incomprehensible is to court contempt": "For peers and gints, quaysirs and galleyliers, fresh letties from the say and stale heady-gabblers, gaingangers and dudder wagoners, pullars off societies and pushers on Rothmere's homes."

. CRICHTON-MILLER. *Marriage, Freedom and Education.* S.C.M. 1s. A courageous examination of a difficult problem by a doctor who has written on the "new psychology".

. E. M. JOAD. *The Horrors of the Countryside.* Hogarth Press. 1s. 6d. "Day to Day Pamphlets, No. 3". In which Dr. Joad enjoys himself.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The Holborn Review (April). The Editorial Notes deal with the Sunday Question and the Roman Catholic education demands. The Rev. J. T. Brewis discusses "Paul and Paulinism", and the Rev. E. B. Storr "Plato: The Father of Idealism". Mr. F. R. Lewis writes on "Some War Plays".

The Hibbert Journal (April). The number is concerned primarily with philosophy: Prof. Dawes Hicks surveys recent philosophical literature; Sir Oliver Lodge writes on "The Interaction of Life and Matter", Mr. F. S. Marvin on "A Mathematical Universe", Prof. H. Wildon Carr on "Is there a World Soul?", Profs. D. F. Fraser-Harris and W. B. Smith on "Mind and Body", and Mr. . P. Cooke on "The Philosopher's Neglect of the Obvious". Mr. Nowell Smith, Mr. W. F. R. Hardie, and Dr. R. E. Stedman deal with Clutton-Brock, G. K. Chesterton, and Bosanquet, respectively.

The London Quarterly (April). Dr. C. J. Wright writes on "God and the Unthomed Universe"; Prof. Foster, of Hong Kong, on "America and China". he Rev. J. A. Findlay compares the First and Fourth Gospels. The Rev. . E. Keeble expounds "The Ideas of Walther Rathenau", and Dr. Courtenay mes "Religion in Shakespeare".

The Baptist Quarterly (April). The opening article (unsigned) advocates Church Union by Federation". Sir Edward Brown writes an appreciation of eorge Hay Morgan, and the Rev. T. R. Dann discusses "Downtown Churches".

The Modern Churchman (April-May). A "Coming-of-Age" number, the Edito surveying the period. The Rev. J. C. Hardwick writes, rather too much i *Evening News* style, on "The Light that Failed"—"the rabble of Bergsonian and Barthians". Sir Harry R. Reichel answers the question "Why Stud Theology?". There is an unsigned article on Phillips Brooks.

The Green Quarterly (Spring). We welcome the photograph of Sir Robe Newman given as a frontispiece, and the further adventures of Mr. Wortle in the London of 2104. Mr. Kenneth Ingram writes on "The New Evangelic Outlook", and there is an account of "Anglo-Catholic Congress Activities".

The Church Quarterly Review (April). Dr. F. L. Cross writes on "God an Modern Physics", the Rev. R. N. Carew Hunt on "Zwingli's Theory of Churc and State", and Dr. Relton on "The Christian Conception of God". Canc Maynard Smith discusses "The Case of Robert Wright". Canon Addlesha is informing on "The French Novel and the Catholic Church (1880-1914)".

The Expository Times (April-June). "Moral Problems of To-day" deal wit "Patriotism" (Mr. H. G. R. Sellon), and "Class Distinctions in the Light of th Gospels" (Dr. F. A. M. Spencer). "National Contributions to Biblical Science" are "German Systematic Theology" (Dr. W. Vollrath) and "Great Britain's Recent Contributions to *N.T.* Studies" (Dr. N. P. Williams). Dr. Garvie represented in "Recent Foreign Theology", in which section Dr. James Moffa also writes.

The Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Fourth Month). "From the House of th Four Winds" deals with the problem of India. Miss Graveson writes on "Friend and their Opportunities in Primary Education", Mr. J. S. Hoyland on "Augustin and the Teaching of the Inward Light", and Mr. Edward Grubb on "Th Foundations of Quakerism".

The British Journal of Inebriety (April). This number is occupied by reviews and by a long study of "Alcoholic Indulgence in Relation to Motor Transport" by Dr. Courtenay C. Weeks.

The International Review of Missions (April). Dr. Cheng expounds "The Fiv Year Movement in China". Especially informing is Dr. Hartenstein on "Barth Theology and Missions". Dr. A. L. Williams writes on "Winning Jews Christ", while Mr. K. G. Grubb's expert knowledge appears in the "India of South America". In "The Cause and Cure of African 'Immorality' ", t Rev. J. W. Hubbard deals with African marriage problems, while new lig is thrown on "Roman Catholic Rural Organization in Belgium" in a contrib tion by Dr. Anet.

World Dominion (April). Prof. B. E. Read tells of "Hospitals in China und Indigenous Leadership", while the Editor has some interesting Chinese r miniscences. Miss Violet Grubb shows how the call for non-professional missio aries is a challenge to live dangerously, while various letters deal with "Missio Education". The Rev. W. Kendall Gale writes in his own racy style abo his work in Madagascar.

The Evangelical Quarterly (April). The same features as before mark th journal—"Fundamentalism" with a considerable amount of learning, and qui valuable articles on the Continental Reformers, especially Mr. De Moor's "Joh Calvin's View of Revelation".

The Harvard Theological Review (January). Prof. La Piana's opening addre at the Harvard Theological School is given the first place, his subject bein "Ancient and Modern Christian Apologetics". Prof. Eells outlines Mart Bucer's contributions to the Reformation, while Mr. R. P. Casey deals w Armenian Manuscripts of St. Athanasius.

The Yale Review (Spring). Mr. Walter Lippmann writes on "Two Revol tions in the American Press", and President Hutchins, of the University Chicago, on "The University of Utopia". Prof. G. F. Doriot is concerned wi "Our Sick Industries"; Europe is represented by Prince D. S. Mirsky on "Boo and Films in Russia", and Maxim Gorky on "Young Soviet Writers". There a poem by Mr. John Masefield and a story by Mr. Sherwood Anderson, whi Mr. H. S. Canby discusses "Thoreau and the Machine Age".

The Review and Expositor (April). The English contributors are again Dr. W. T. Whitley ("Collaboration") and the Rev. A. D. Belden ("Equality"). Dr. C. N. Bartlett compares "The Course of Catholicism in Canada and Mexico"; Mr. W. J. McGlothlin writes on "The Problem of Worship", and Mr. J. Wash Watts on "Opportunities for Evangelical Missions in Palestine".

Anglican Theological Review (April). Dr. B. W. Bacon asks "Is Baptism Syncretistic?"; Dr. F. J. Hall's subject is "Miracle", and Dr. Easton's "The Mind of Christ in Paul". Mr. H. H. Lumpkin's contribution deals with Hugh Latimer.

Biblical Review (April). The "Review" dealing with "Trends in Religious Thought" is once more useful. The Rev. R. Birch Hoyle writes on "The Paraclete in Tertullian's Writings", Mr. P. W. Wilson on "The Mood of Atheism", and Dr. J. L. Reve on "German Rationalism at its First Appearance".

DISCUSSIONS.

RETRIBUTION IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

THESIS : *That in the employment of such words as hell and punishment our Lord makes use of an old language and applies it not to the sinners outside but to those within His Kingdom, " of the ungirt loin, the unlit lamp ".*

IT is natural that we should turn to the words of the Master as we seek to know the truth concerning that which lies beyond the veil. Every one of these words has been examined under a microscope. I am going to suggest, however, that the conclusions drawn from this examination have to be revised in view of the fact that in almost every instance our Lord gave to the language of Retribution a new application and consequently a fresh significance. In all religions words come into use which point to and describe the dreadful fate which awaits those who are beyond the pale of the true Faith, those who have wantonly broken its laws, and those who have been excommunicated. The words are employed by those who are within, who are safe. In practically all religious teaching, in all ages and lands, lurid pictures of hell fire have been painted, under a great variety of names.

A persistent motive for the faithful observance of religious duties, the performance of prescribed ceremonies, the offering of gifts and sacrifices, is the desire to escape from the doom which these words threaten.

In the teaching of Jesus there is much that is His very own, a priceless, dateless kernel. But there is, of necessity, a good deal which lay to His hand and which He used in His own way. It is characteristic of Him that He took and employed a language of Retribution which we may call conventional. It is also characteristic of Him that He made use of it in an entirely original fashion. Those who have turned to His words in search of guidance have not usually allowed for this.

This old language was like a row of guns placed on the fortifications of the Faith, breathing out threatening and slaughter to those who were without. What Jesus actually does is to turn the guns round and give the defenders a taste of their own thunderbolts.

So far as this language is concerned there is really nothing new in the Gospels. It is borrowed; only, whereas we have always applied it to the sinners outside, He applies it to ourselves. Even to-day in this matter the mental attitude of many is " B.C.".

I can only deal cursorily with a few instances :

1. To whom does this apply : "Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall

be in danger of hellfire"? Clearly this is the representation of a mora standard which the Master sets before His own disciples. The fault whic deserves punishment is the scornful word, born of a sense of superiorit social or religious. Such a word has been used constantly by those wh regarded themselves and were regarded by others as Christians. But th have always switched off the ugly threat from themselves and on to t sinners outside. Consequently few of us even now take the Master's wor seriously.

2. Another instance in which the dread words are applied to tho within is the great saying ending, "It is better to enter into life maime rather than having two hands or feet to be cast into hellfire". To this added the grim detail of the undying worm.

No one, hearing or reading such words, could fail to feel the moral in tensity with which they are charged. All the more are we startled to not that they are applied to those who break down in their discipline, not t the reckless sinners out there in the street. They are applied to those wh have accepted the discipline involved in the words often quoted lightly, "I any man will come after me let him deny himself and take up his cross an follow me"; and because we refuse to believe that the gun can possibly b pointed at us we have almost lost the very idea of Christian discipline.

3. In this same light are we to read those mournful phrases whic speak of the outer darkness and the gnashing of teeth. They are applie by our Lord to the undisciplined, to the slackers amongst those servant whom He has trusted. Those of us who can look back to a lifetime o Christian preaching have consistently heard them applied to the impenite as descriptive of their inevitable fate. In reality they have no such appl cation. But we are unwilling to recognize what the application is.

4. One of the most striking illustrations of what I call turning t guns is the tremendous, "How shall ye escape the damnation of hell?" spoken to the Pharisees. Jesus is here, of course, denouncing what H regards as grave moral obliquity. But He is addressing the class of m who have come to regard as their prerogative the language of "commin tion or denouncing of God's anger and judgment against sinners". all religions and in all Churches this class occupies, has occupied, prominent place. The words are somewhat softer in the Greek than in o familiar version, but when one thinks of what they must have been wh hurled from a heart white with the heat of indignation, one begins t understand why those who felt the force of them wanted to silence th speaker in death. The words are addressed not to "sinners", but to priest and ministers and elders and deacons. The Master used other forms o speech, quite other, when He spoke to the publicans and sinners who wer accustomed to the language of commination.

5. In the great parable of Judgment the words, "Depart from m . . . into everlasting fire", have been taken constantly to point to th doom of the wicked, the impenitent sinners. And for a moment it seem incredible that they could mean anything else. Yet it is as plain as any thing can be that in thus using the words we are divorcing them from the context. The words do not apply to those against whom they have bee hurled by preachers down through the ages. Thus applied, the doom ha been pronounced of those who remain outside the Kingdom, those wi refuse proffered grace. But in the actual parable none of those who a condemned are "hell-deserving" according to our ordinary standards an tests. Indeed, conventional tests are ignored, and others applied whic would place on the left most of us who are regarded by others and wh

egard ourselves as good Christians. Therefore we have unconsciously egressed to a " B.C." attitude of mind and comfort ourselves with the eflexion that such language can only apply to the unbelieving and the egraded outside the circle of safety within which we are. Those on the eft are to all appearance decent folk like ourselves, and, like ourselves, hey are too busy, too pre-occupied with their own affairs to notice the un- ortunate around them. We, too, literally don't see them : and it doesn't isturb us. Even to-day we do not believe that this attitude of mind is, *ub specie æternitatis,* disastrous. We are content to build prisons and ospitals and shelters. In those who need them we do not see the Lord; nd He looks through their eyes and pronounces judgment. The condem- ation is that we have become religiously selfish, which is a contradiction n terms. With the old language of commination He would stab our pirits broad awake. All that He means we may not know. This, at east, He means, that the soul cannot thrive if the eyes of the heart are blind.

6. " And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." Who? n ordinary suburban who, so far as we know, lived a blameless life ccording to conventional standards. There are plenty of Christians who n similar circumstances would have had Lazarus removed by the police. here is no hint that the rich man was "hell-deserving" in the sense of eing an infidel or an evil-doer. He simply put himself first as multitudes o who have every hope that they will find themselves feasting in Paradise ith the Saints.

Thus, very briefly, I have gone over most of the passages in which our ord makes use of the old language which lay to His hand. It was and ver has been employed as an artillery brought to bear upon the consciences f those without the safety zone. Jesus takes it and directs it against the onsciences of those who believe themselves within. Inasmuch as we have eft it from its context and have restored it to its old use we have failed to ecognize the terrific moral earnestness of His appeal to those who would ome after Him. It is no longer "very hard to be a Christian". Our hristianity lays emphasis on His Cross, no longer on ours.

Further, we have taken those words upon His lips as if they were His wn and as His contribution to the sum of knowledge we have of the arker side of the world unseen. What is His is not the language at all. hat was ever man's. What we may find in the words is not additional nowledge of the Unseen but light on His conception of the high calling ith which His disciples are called.

The one instance which might seem to be an exception to the general ule occurs in the Parable of the Tares, where doom is pronounced against ne children of the wicked one. But even here the tares were hardly to be istinguished from the wheat at first. They grew in the same soil.

By this I do not for a moment suggest or imagine that there is no truth n the language of Retribution as it applies to those who, of choice, con- nue to walk in darkness, who refuse the Light. On that subject I take he last word to be, " The time is come that judgment must begin at the ouse of God; and if it first begin at us what shall the end be of them that bey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where hall the ungodly and the sinner appear?".

All that I urge is that on the lips of the Lord Jesus the ancient language f commination was not directed against the ungodly and the sinners but sed as a whip of cords with which He sought to cleanse His Temple.

J. Bruce Gardiner.

MR. LENWOOD AND HIS REVIEWERS.

SIR,—I should like to make a few comments on Mr. Whale's review of *Jesus—Lord or Leader?* They may be arranged for the most part round what he says about Mr. Lenwood and *Formgeschichte.*

(1) Mr. Whale cites a list of *N.T.* scholars whose work, it is assumed, has been ignored by Mr. Lenwood, who, by passing over the results of their scholarship, has left out of consideration many things which would reduce the cogency of his argument. " He is curiously silent about the transforming work of such men as Bousset, R. Knopf, Gerhard Kittel and Bultmann ". It is unfortunate for the effectiveness of his criticism that Mr. Whale has included Bousset and Bultmann, especially Bultmann in his list; for these two critics represent a tendency with which Mr. Whale disagrees. He criticizes Mr. Lenwood for echoing " the old assumption that Christology was largely *Gemeindetheologie* ", and yet Bousset and Bultmann are among the foremost advocates of this assumption. Bousset in the first hundred pages or so of *Kyrios Christos,* insists time after time that a large number of the incidents in the Gospels—especially those having reference to the Messianic character of the ministry of Jesus—are the products of the theology of the *Urgemeinde.* Bultmann, who is greatly indebted to Bousset (and Wrede and Baur, I might add), goes even further, and excludes as unhistorical all but a very few passages which he reprints in his *Jesus.* Bultmann's *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition,* which rejects pretty nearly every synoptic narrative on the ground that it conforms to some set pattern, and is therefore artificial, is accepted as a valuable contribution to the understanding of the historical life of Jesus simply leads to a scepticism or even an agnosticism which makes the Gospels utterly unreliable. The Messianic passage in *Mark* 9, *e.g.,* Bultmann rejects with the utmost dogmatism, insisting that the whole incident is a product of the *Urgemeinde.* The *Jesus* book is dominated all through by Bultmann's particular theological standpoint, and cannot be looked to for any help in the task of biographical or Christological reconstruction or analysis. It is this sort of thing which Mr. Lenwood repudiates outright, and Mr. Whale appears to criticize him for doing so.

(2) If, as Mr. Whale seems to think, Bousset and Bultmann are right, then his own orthodoxy, which he is at pains to defend, is somewhat questionable. If Bultmann, Bousset, and, earlier, Wrede, are right in assuming that the Messianic interpretation of the ministry of Jesus is a piece of *Urgemeindedogmatik,* then Sir E. C. Hoskyns, to whom he refers, must be wrong. With which of these two positions *does* Mr. Whale agree?

(3) Mr. Whale considers that the method known as *Formgeschichte* would invalidate Mr. Lenwood's conclusions. But how? *If* the conclusions of the *Formgeschichte* school are right, they would invalidate any conclusions made as to the historicity (and therefore reliability as a basis for Christology) of the Synoptic Gospels. But the question is, are they? I believe few reliable critics would assent to Bultmann's claims and conclusions, which are frequently quite arbitrary. Because an incident conforms to a pattern, it is not genuine. For example, in the miracles of healing, which occur in similar forms, we have only fictitious narratives with no historical foundation. And yet, one may ask, could the processes described in the " miracles " of healing conceivably happen in any manner other than that in which they are described? The investigations of the *Formgeschichtler* into the *Logia,* and their arrangement and classification

them, stand, it is true, on a somewhat different footing. But if a critic tes the *Formgeschichte* people in evidence against anyone, he must be repared to take the rough with the smooth.

Mr. Whale cannot have it both ways. Either *Formgeschichte* and its sults are right or they are wrong. If they are right, according to Mr. Vhale the arguments of *Jesus—Lord or Leader?* are invalidated, though e has not shown how; if they are wrong, and I doubt if Mr. Whale would e prepared to go any distance with Bultmann in his dogmatic speculations, en they make no difference to Mr. Lenwood's position. Either way, is difficult to perceive their relevance. To conclude this discussion of ormgeschichte, it may be added that neither Dibelius nor K. L. Schmidt as dogmatic in his conclusions as Bultmann; but the latter belongs to e group quite as much as they do. It would have made things clearer Mr. Whale had been more precise in his references. In any case, I do ot see why the group should be connected in any way with the "Crisis" eology, with which, as a group, they have no contact.

(4) I should like to add one or two further comments. The kind of gument which urges that if Mr. Lenwood is right, Irenæus, Augustine, d the rest must be wrong, and Christianity is a "pathetic superstition", ll not carry much weight. The attitude of the Traditionalists towards alileo was just the same: if he were right, then Ptolemy and Aristotle d Aquinas were all wrong. And so they were. I am not assuming that r. Lenwood is right: I only suggest that the argument from Tradition not logically defensible. The ultimate test, of course, is to compare r. Lenwood's Christology with, *e.g.*, Augustine's. Of the two I should efer Mr. Lenwood's. Does the soteriology of either Irenæus or Augus- ne really appeal to so good a theologian as Mr. Whale? Does he fancy e passage in which Augustine describes the Cross of Christ as a mouse- ap, to bait the Devil with (*Muscipula diaboli, Crux Dei*)? Would Mr. Vhale be prepared to subscribe to the views of Atonement found in ther, Dale, or P. T. Forsyth? I doubt very much if he would.

Most of Mr. Lenwood's reviewers seem to have passed over his dis- ssion of the orthodox view of the Divinity of Jesus. They have agreed with him, but have not accepted his challenge and met him on s own ground. They have said that he ought to believe in the Divinity Jesus and have pointed out the inadequacy of a Christology which nies the Incarnation (whatever the term may precisely mean). But they ve not dealt with Mr. Lenwood's arguments. A reviewer in the *ectator* suggests that he ought to have taken into account the recent rk of Father Thornton, Prof. Leonard Hodgson, and Archbishop mple. I do not know whether Mr. Lenwood has read these writers; most probably has. But as each of them, Father Thornton in particular, proaches Christology from the standpoint of metaphysic and not of ticism, the suggestion is hardly relevant. In *The Incarnate Lord* ther Thornton fits a Christology into the centre of a vast metaphysic, pearing to regard Jesus as a kind of concretion in time of a supra- smic, supra-historical principle. Prof. Hodgson does not achieve any- ng positively new in his essay. Dr. Temple's references to the humanity d Divinity of Jesus seem to me to be full of self-contradictions.

In discussions about the Incarnation and the Divinity of Jesus it is eless to point out to the writer who is being criticized what other people ve said. In any case, the truth of what they do say lies beyond veri- ation, and is therefore no more finally valid than what may be urged in ntradiction to them. No one has yet shown in what the Incarnation sists; that is perhaps the most useful contribution to theology which

orthodoxy has made. The form of condemned heresy (it should be calle condemned orthodoxy) known as Apollinarianism was wrong; the Kenot Christology which was once fashionable is scarcely ever defended to-da Some Modernists have tried to interpret the Person of Jesus in terms the immanental indwelling of God in Jesus; Anglo-Catholics have trounce them for doing so. Mr. Lenwood, seeing that a dozen notions about th Divinity of Jesus have been elaborated, attacked, condemned, defende seems quite within his rights in seeking a Christology which is simpl and less question-raising. But immediately anyone does this—whoever may be—all the otherwise dis-united orthodox unite themselves in a pr miscuous army to condemn a heresy which repudiates both heresy an orthodoxy.

For some considerable time I have been trying to find something whic will make more comprehensible to me what people mean when they sa that Jesus is Divine, or that Jesus is God (the two things are the same The more I read the more muddled I become, and find equally confusin the Traditionalists who say that Jesus is God and Divine, and th Modernists who virtually (though cautiously) reject the Godhead of Jesu and still accept His Divinity. Whatever Divinity means for them, it doe not mean Divinity, unless (to quote Mr. Lenwood) " with a minus sign " If people say that they believe in the Divinity of Jesus one has a right t ask what they mean. And they do not seem to know.

The same applies to a Soteriology. Atonement means what it says Atonement. As far as I have been able to understand them, the olde views of the Atonement, such as those held by Irenæus, Augustine, Luthe (whom Mr. Whale mentions), and the ultra-evangelicals of the last century are utterly revolting in their notion of both God and man, and scarcel anyone to-day, except perhaps some Anglo-Catholics, would be prepare to defend them even in a modified form. Modernists offer a more accep able soteriology; but it has little connexion with the time-honoure doctrines of the Atonement: I might refer, *e.g.*, to books on the Aton ment by Rashdall and J. M. Wilson. What is the outsider, or even th Christian who wishes to get rid of notions which he considers extraneou to the religion of Jesus, to think about these theological disagreements

However eager some theologians may be to compromise with Tra ditionalism, it is difficult to see how they can evade Mr. Lenwood criticisms of the Jesus-worship which underlies much of our Christianity Knowing what we do of Jesus (assuming that the Gospels are not wha Bultmann considers them to be) we are fairly safe in assuming that Jesus a Jew, would find worship of Himself utterly revolting. I do not see ho anyone can get away from that. And if Christianity is, after all, th religion of Jesus, not ultimately of Paul or Luther, or anyone else, thi Jesus-worship cannot but be regarded as a contradiction of the will of th Master. An easy dismissal of "Why callest thou me good? " does no really carry much force.

I have written considerably more than I had intended at the beginning and have entered on grounds on which I had also no intention of treading But as a reader of Mr. Lenwood's book as well as of some reviews of I do feel urged (and I hope this urge will not be confused with lack o modesty) to add a word or two, if not in support of Mr. Lenwood, at leas in criticism of his critics.

GERAINT V. JONES.